THE PERMANENT VALUE

OF THE

BOOK OF GENESIS

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES, 1894

THE PERMANENT VALUE

OF THE

BOOK OF GENESIS

AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

Being the Paddock Lectures for 1894

BY

C. W. E. BODY, M.A., D.C.L.

PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK, SOMETIME PROVOST OF TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO, AND FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

NEW YORK
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND LONDON
1894

THE CAXTON PRESS
NEW YORK

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND THE BISHOPS OF CONNECTICUT,
LONG ISLAND AND MASSACHUSETTS

AND THE

VERY REV. THE DEAN OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BY WHOSE APPOINTMENT THESE LECTURES
WERE DELIVERED
THIS FRUIT OF THEIR INVITATION IS DEDICATED
WITH SINCERE RESPECT

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES.

In the summer of the year 1880, George A. Jarvis, of Brooklyn, N. Y., moved by his sense of the great good which might thereby accrue to the cause of Christ, and to the Church of which he was an ever-grateful member, gave to the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church certain securities, exceeding in value eleven thousand dollars, for the foundation and maintenance of a Lectureship in said seminary.

Out of love to a former pastor and enduring friend, the Right Rev. Benjamin Henry Paddock, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts, he named the foundation "The Bishop Paddock Lectureship."

The deed of trust declares that "*The subjects* of the lectures shall be such as appertain to the defence of the religion of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the *Holy Bible*, and illustrated in the *Book of Common Prayer*, against the varying errors of the day, whether material-

istic, rationalistic, or professedly religious, and also to its defence and confirmation in respect of such central truths as the *Trinity*, the *Atonement*, *Justification*, and the *Inspiration of the Word of God;* and of such central facts as the *Church's Divine Order and Sacraments*, her historical *Reformation*, and her rights and powers as a pure and national Church. *And* other subjects may be chosen if unanimously approved by the Board of Appointment as being both timely and also within the true intent of this Lectureship."

Under the appointment of the Board created by the trust, the Rev. C. W. E. Body, M.A., D.C.L., delivered the Lectures for the year 1894, contained in this volume.

PREFACE.

THE accompanying Lectures were written amidst the incessant demands of responsible administrative work. In accordance with the regulation governing the Bishop Paddock foundation, they are now published as a contribution to Old Testament study. They do not aim at setting forth a clear-cut, critical theory, a task which the present writer would regard as altogether premature, even if he felt himself qualified to undertake it. Their object is rather to plead for a re-examination from certain fundamental standpoints, to which adequate attention does not seem to have been given, of modern critical hypotheses which are clamouring for immediate acceptance. They embody a strong personal conviction that great harm will result from regarding such matters as fully decided, either on the part of Old Testament scholars or of the Church at large. It seems hardly necessary to add that in empha-

sising strongly points of difference from well-known authorities, I cordially unite in the appreciation of their high literary position and ripe scholarship.

C. W. E. BODY.

New York, *October*, 1894.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

THE CRITICAL PROBLEM IN GENERAL.

LECTURE II.

THE LITERARY ANALYSIS CRITICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

LECTURE III.

THE CREATION AND PARADISE.

LECTURE IV.

THE FALL AND ITS IMMEDIATE RESULTS.

LECTURE V.

THE DELUGE AND THE PATRIARCHS.

THE DELUGE.

I.

THE CRITICAL PROBLEM IN GENERAL.

LECTURE I.

THE CRITICAL PROBLEM IN GENERAL.

The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.—1 Tim. iii. 15.

There can be little question that a widespread feeling of anxiety exists as to the effect on the Christian faith of the higher criticism of the Old Testament. It is no new phenomenon in the experience of our generation to find itself confronted with serious issues affecting some part of divine revelation.

Some of us can recall the controversies as to the authenticity of the Gospels and the other New Testament books, which were raised by the Tubingen school; and again, the questions which grew out of geological discovery; or, still later, of the Darwinian theory of evolution, in their bearing on the early chapters of the Book of Genesis. As we now look back on these half-forgotten controversies, which, in their day, seemed so threatening, the retrospect surely is one of much encouragement.

"History," it has been well said, is "a good tonic for desponding souls;" and if there be any truth in the maxim, no Christian believer need feel despondent under present difficulties. As Bishop Barry puts it, in his recent volume of Bampton Lectures, "The experience of the last half century, may, I must think, read to us lessons of encouragement. I have myself seen methods of such criticism come and go, sometimes destroying each other. I have seen results of criticism, once accepted as final and imperishable, now rejected on all hands; and doctrines of Revelation once scouted as unphilosophical and impossible now allowed to be accordant with the truest and deepest philosophy."* Or, to quote another competent authority, himself no unfriendly opponent of the critics, perhaps we may some of us think even too ready to accept some of their conclusions, I mean the author of this year's Bampton Lectures on Inspiration, Professor Sanday. "Scarcely one of the discoveries of recent years has not had for its tendency to bring back the course of criticism into paths nearer to those marked out by ancient tradition."† "He that believeth will

* Some Lights of Science on the Faith, p. 38.

† Two present day questions, p. 37.

not make haste ;" and with regard to few issues is such strong, patient reserve of final judgment more necessary than in reference to many of the delicate and complicated literary questions of the Old Testament Criticism.

These theories of literary analysis, these methods of determining the dates of ancient documents by mutual comparison, depend for the most part upon the convergent force of a number of minute points to which the minds of different men will assign very unequal value. Thus, even with the trained perception of great scholars, the very same phenomena will lead them at one time unhesitatingly to one conclusion, and will be held at another to indicate precisely the opposite. To the mind of Ewald, for example, the phenomena of the Hexateuch necessitated the placing of the source from which the first chapter of Genesis is assumed to be taken far earlier than that of the next two chapters. All critics now hold the very reverse. It is, of course, true that this reversal of judgment is mainly due to the introduction into the question of historical considerations which have overturned the previous results of purely internal literary criticism ; but the fact only throws into stronger emphasis the complicated and uncertain

nature of the investigations in question. How largely the subjectivity of the critics must show itself in such refined and subtle analysis, is confessed by Eichorn, who may justly be ranked as the founder of modern Old Testament criticism.

Speaking of this work a century ago, Eichorn says: "It demands a healthful and ever cheerful spirit, and how long will one maintain it in such toilsome investigations. It demands the keenest insight into the internal condition of every book, and who will not be dulled after a while?"* Nor can it be urged that the concentration of so many minds on the subject, since Eichorn's time, has removed the force of this difficulty, for look at the situation to-day. Our leading English authority, Dr. Driver, as some of you will remember, postulates for the Hexateuch (excluding Deuteronomy), three primary sources, two of which he acknowledges it is often impossible to accurately distinguish from each other—a supplemental source, and probably two redactors—six in all; while Dr. Cornell, one of the most eminent of contemporary critics in Germany, requires some fifteen

* Preface to second edition of "Introduction to the Old Testament," quoted in Briggs' "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 50.

hands at least to account for the same phenomena. No doubt with regard to the purely literary question, "in the end the specialists must decide." But the fact that the decision still remains to be given is equally undisputable; and after one hundred years of analysis it would seem probable, from the results so far attained, that the end was still remote. One of the most recent critical writers, Mr. Addis, candidly admits, that as new facts are brought to light, the theories which account for them must change; and proceeds: "We shall see that the work is very far from being ended now"*—a frank statement of the actual condition of the case. For it must be borne in mind that the question of real importance goes much deeper than merely what are the limits to be assigned to one or more assumed original documents. We must then go on to consider the relative position and number of these documents, and what light is thus thrown upon their literary history, date and trustworthiness. That in the first thirty chapters of Genesis, as stated by Dr. Briggs,† critics should be fairly agreed as to the limits of the source usually denoted by the

* Addis, "Documents of the Hexateuch." Introduction, p. xxiv.

† See his "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 143.

letter "P," is of little real consequence if "P" itself now turns out to be exceedingly composite, and is assumed to be made up of an indefinite number of sources P_1 P_2—P_x; the result, of course, being that all the questions which were originally raised as to the date and origin of P have now to be transferred to each of its original sources.

The vista thus opened up is not only long, but, so far as we can see, limitless. The result seems to point rather to the possible fruitlessness of the method employed than to the likelihood of attaining really ultimate conclusions thereby. Under such circumstances, it does, indeed, seem somewhat premature for Dr. Briggs to lay down the dictum that "in the field of scholarship the question is settled. It only remains for the ministry and the people to accept it and adapt themselves to it."* On the contrary, nothing, it would seem, could be more disastrous than that Christian people generally should come to regard, as finally closed in the present critical direction, questions so intricate in their various parts, so uncertain for the most part, alike, in their method and their results, and so far-reaching in their ultimate

* Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, p. 144. ff.

issues. Granted by all means that these questions once raised cannot be ignored or shelved, that they deserve and should receive the deepest consideration at the hands of our most devout and scholarly minds. Let all this be asserted as emphatically as may be necessary. Not merely let the German critical conclusions be revised by the independent study of our best English and American thinkers, but let their methods be supplemented by a wider and deeper research, in which considerations, archæological, historical, and not least, theological, will be fully taken into account.

Certainly it can hardly be said that we have as yet much more than the promise of such an exhaustive treatment of the question by English-speaking scholars. Professor Robertson Smith's "Old Testament in the Jewish Church" is little more than a course of popular lectures on some main aspects of the subject, delivered at first with a local and personal aim, with the object of dispelling prejudice created against him by his trial before the Free Kirk of Scotland. Canon Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" is unquestionably a most valuable work; but, as its title indicates, it is entirely concerned with the internal

and literary side of the question to the exclusion of other aspects. Moreover, we have Canon Driver's own authority for saying that its size is so limited by the terms of his agreement with the publishers as to prevent anything like an adequate discussion of the grounds on which his various conclusions rest.* These two volumes may be taken practically to represent the whole presentation of the critical problem to the English-speaking public by our own scholars. It is perhaps unfortunate, that under these circumstances the nature of Canon Driver's book should compel him to put forth many results, the grounds of which he is unable fully to explain, and that he is accordingly obliged to fall back for his authority so largely upon the

* Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. "For it is not more than just to myself that I should state, that by the terms of my agreement, I was *limited in space:* . . . . There have been many matters on which I would gladly have given fuller particulars; there have been opinions which I should often be glad to notice or discuss more fully than I have done, if only out of respect for those who held them; but my limits have forbidden this, and I have repeatedly omitted or abbreviated what I had originally written, sometimes, no doubt, to the reader's advantage, though perhaps not always so. . . . . Completeness has not been attainable. Sometimes, indeed, the grounds for a conclusion have been stated with approximate completeness; but generally it has been found impossible to mention more than the more salient or important ones. This is especially the case in the analysis of the Hexateuch A full statement and discussion of the grounds for this belongs to a commentary." Preface, p. v., vi.

agreement of German critics. Assuming that German methods, however valuable, have, as Professor Ramsay has lately shown, their special dangers,* that they do therefore need to be corrected by the same exhaustive and patient skill which English scholars have so splendidly brought to bear upon similar hypotheses with regard to the New Testament writings; it is clear that such a process of corrective revision can only be said to have begun.

The clergy and people can therefore well afford to work on at present undisturbed by problems of this kind, whilst using the Sacred Word for those eternal purposes for which it was given to the Church—for the education of human consciences and for the building up of souls in faith and holiness. Moreover, we should not forget that by the practically unanimous consent of English speaking critics, their conclusions in no way affect the Divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, or the reverend regard due to the Revelation they enshrine. On the contrary, it is claimed by its chief English supporters that the results of the Higher Criticism tend to strengthen men's apprehension of both these points. Our clergy may, however, be content to bear with

* See Appendix A.

some complacency any temporary loss in this respect, as the applications which have hitherto been made of the Higher Criticism to this end e. g. in Canon Cheyne's recent volume called the "Hallowing of Criticism," do not appear to be so strikingly successful as to lead ordinary parish priests to anticipate great results from a similar method in their ministrations to an average congregation. A recent writer in one of our leading magazines has rebuked theologians for spending time over disputing whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch which would be more usefully employed in disseminating correct ideas as to economic and social questions, particularly as to what "constitutes a measure or standard of value," and has had something to say even for so novel and startling a proposition. However much, so far as professed theologians are concerned, can rightly and conclusively be urged on the other side, at least this measure of truth may be conceded in the assertion, that the application of the Divine Word to the varying needs of men is the paramount office of the Church, and that this is not likely to be greatly advanced by a discussion whether the passage thus applied is taken from P_1, P_2 or P_x. Undoubtedly every question affecting,

however indirectly, God's Holy Word, is of great interest to a devout soul, and the matter in hand well merits the sympathetic study of our clergy and better educated laity. But it cannot be too strongly emphasized that in the present state of the question anything but a suspended decision on many of its literary issues would be for most of us alike premature and unnecessary.

Nor need we fear that the main and essential questions will in this way be settled behind our backs by a few Hebrew specialists. The work which will decide the points which really concern our religious life must be fully laid open to the Christian public; and the ultimate decision will rest not with Oriental specialists, but with the enlightened consciousness of the Church put in possession of all the facts, and informed by the Eternal and Divine Spirit. For the arguments from style and vocabulary, which must of course be mainly estimated by specialists, confessedly play but a comparatively unimportant part in the matter. The critics of the present day allow that on this side of their position they can lay least stress, although it was originally the ground upon which the whole critical fabric rested. In the great mass of the Old Testament writings (excluding certain books like Ezra,

Chronicles, etc.,) no such difference of style exists as to form a reasonable ground for determining thereby the date of the document. Prof. Robertson Smith maintains * that the Hebrew text underwent a complete revision at the hands of "the Scribes," after which all variant copies were destroyed; upon which Dr. Hodgkins, the eminent European historian, pertinently remarks: "If the Masoretic plough and harrow have gone over the ground obliterating the marks of earlier destructions, it seems to me that the question of the authorship of the different books is very much taken out of the hands of Hebrew specialists." † The toil of investigation must, of course, fall upon the few, but the ultimate decision as to the validity of their conclusions, so far as they really affect the

* "Old Testament in the Jewish Church." (2nd. Ed.) "There is abundant evidence that in earlier ages Hebrew books differed as much as books of the New Testament or more." p. 60.

"In later times every trace of these variant copies disappeared. They must have been suppressed or gradually superseded by a deliberate effort which has been happily compared by Prof. Nöldeke, to the action of the Caliph Othman in destroying all copies of the Koran which diverged from the standard text that he had adopted. There can be no question who were the instruments in their work. The Scribes alone possessed the necessary influence to give one text or one standard MS. a position of such supreme authority." pp. 62, 63.

† Old Testament Criticism, p. 14.

position and office of the Old Testament Scriptures, will be with the Christain consciousness at large: with the verdict of the great spiritual society, the Church of the living God, ordained to be for all time, the pillar and ground of the Truth.

We may perhaps draw a useful illustration at this point from the almost exhausted controversy as to Evolution. We are so accustomed to-day to see theologians postulating Evolution as a probable method of the Divine working that it requires a mental effort to recall the antagonism at one time assumed to exist between the two. If we set ourselves to ask what has brought about this changed relation, the answer is clear. It has come from the gradual disentangling of the scientific and religious aspects of the matter. The claim of evolutionists to deduce from a primordial molecular arrangement all the phenomena of the Universe, both mental and spiritual, has been seen to be an utterly unscientific deduction from the biological phenomena on which the theory rests; whilst in the domain of physical life itself it has only made more prominent the immanence of a Divine Mind to conduct the evolutionary process to such stupendous

and magnificent results. Thus the Theistic or Christain view of nature has found in Evolution as a scientific attempt to indicate the manner of God's creative working, a friend rather than a foe, so soon as it was disentangled from its materialistic dress and reduced to the limits of a purely scientific question. The result has certainly been to enrich theology with deeper and grander views of teleology than were current amongst us before, however true it may be that such deeper views are not themselves new, but were familiar in the teaching of the great Doctors of the ancient Church: whilst on the other hand the scientific study of the matter has been allowed to proceed on its own lines undisturbed by theological questions. Not, of course, that all evolutionary questions can thereby be held to have been set at rest, at least from a scientific standpoint. The names of Romanes and Weismann, of Huxley and Spencer, at once suggest scientific aspects of the matter of an almost fundamental character on which the gravest divergence exists. But the matter is freed from alien issues. The questions at stake have been seen to have no vital bearing on the substance of the Christian faith.

A little learning is proverbially dangerous, and the same thing is true of the effect of the first presentation of a great question to the world. It takes some time usually for the true limits of a subject to come home to the popular apprehension and for its real bearing on other departments of knowledge to be accurately seen. Hence, to shorten so far as may be this period of confusion and so to minimize its unsettling effects, is eminently desirable. When the smoke has cleared away and the various aspects of a question, spiritual, philosophical and scientific are clearly and accurately distinguished, we may generally leave each to its appropriate method of verification with little risk of harm.

A precisely similar necessity appears to exist in regard to the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. The purely literary questions raised by Astruc more than a century ago as to the sources made use of by Moses in the composition of the Pentateuch have issued in a complex growth of considerations, literary, historical, philosophical and theological, which are vaguely grouped together under this one head. The complex issues thus raised must clearly be tried by completely different standards of veri-

fication and judgment arrived at in utterly diverse ways. The theological question, for example, as to the unity of the Revelation of God made in the several parts of the Hexateuch, appeals to very different faculties, and must be tried at the bar of a totally distinct tribunal from those of literary analysis and comparison. The same is surely true with matters philosophical which deal with the origin and growth of religion on the one side, and matters historical which must be decided by actual concrete evidence on the other.

One fundamental object I have set before myself in this lecture is to emphasize the necessity for the subdivision of these various problems, and to endeavour to contribute in some degree towards the task. It is well known that the danger of many explosives lies in their holding certain substances in combination which when separated are perfectly harmless. The analogy is, I think, a true one. As matters now stand, there seems grave danger on many sides lest fundamental moral and spiritual truths should be assumed to hang upon the issue of purely literary methods ; or, even worse, should be reduced to a condition of more or less suspended animation for the indefinite period which may

elapse before these literary matters arrive at a final solution. It may, of course, be found that the separation here advocated is impossible, that the connection between the several classes of issues is so close and vital as to defy any such attempt at analysis. But in any case the effort is worth making as indicating one of the most hopeful directions from which the matter can be approached. Its failure can in no way aggravate the situation, while its success would very largely remove the present tension and promote the causes alike of truth and charity.

To commence, then, with the *literary* problem. It would seem that this is in itself independent of all other factors, whether philosophical, theological or historical, and at least for the time may be considered separately. Allowing due weight to the difficulties which undeniably affect such purely internal analysis, the critics claim that the literary structure of Genesis, for example, bears witness to its having been derived from three documentary sources which have subsequently been combined into the present book. We may speak of these as J. E. and P. respectively.

Now, there is nothing in this hypothesis,

considered in itself, which is in the least inimical to the full historical trustworthiness of the composite narrative thus obtained. The phenomena of the Synoptist Gospels, for example, have familiarized us with the conceptions of three parallel accounts, each resting back upon a common basis of experience and testimony, whilst the recently recovered Diatessaron of Tatian has given us an indisputable example of the composite narrative which may thus be formed. We are familiar also with the thought that the historical character of the events recorded in the Gospels, such as the Resurrection of our Lord, derives much greater weight from this threefold cord of independent and parallel testimony than if we had only in our hands one combined narrative like that of the Diatessaron, and had not learned to decompose it into its original sources. We have learned, too, from studying the several accounts of our Lord's Resurrection and its attendant circumstances, that minor discrepancies, such as the microscope of criticism has magnified into exaggerated importance, are of no practical weight against the general concurrence of these independent witnesses; and in fact rather strengthen their

evidence by demonstrating the independent origin of the several documents.

Further, the Synoptist problem has made it quite clear that when we have analyzed our Diatessaron into its component parts, we have done little more than state the really ultimate problem, which is to find the common basis, like the substratum common to the Gospels, which underlies these parallel sources, to estimate the authority possessed by that original groundwork, and its relation to each of the three derived documents. Our experience (we may note here in passing) has taught us the apparently insuperable difficulty in solving this last problem; the real problem of importance, even when the conditions are so eminently favorable as they are in the case of the Synoptist Gospels. So far, then, as the historical character of the book is concerned, it would seem that the critical questions thus outlined may safely be left to their legitimate methods of solution, if such complete solution should ever prove to be possible.*

*cf; Robertson, "Early Religion of Israel." "As to the critical process of separating the sources as literary products, I regard it as a matter of secondary importance, so long as we are able, by the help of the prophetic writings, to determine in a general way that the books, in their combined form, are trustworthy documents, etc." P. 477.

Nor, if we take the assumed composite character of the books as evidence of their being *post-Mosaic* in their present form, does there seem any adequate reason, historical or theological, to debar us from the attempt to deal with the matter from the purely literary standpoint. The fact that Moses is the chief actor and speaker throughout the major part of the narrative no more involves Mosaic authorship, than the similar fact with regard to Our Blessed Lord in the Gospels requires us to reject their Apostolic origin, or to dispute their relation to the oral Gospel and Apostolic preaching on the one side, to Tatian and his Diatessaron on the other. Nor does the general tradition of Mosaic authorship which we have inherited appear to seriously affect the issue. We have only to think of the Psalms of David or the Proverbs of Solomon to recall books admittedly composite, books whose literary history in their present form extends for centuries after the dates of David and Solomon respectively. Thus we can hardly help seeing that the traditional linking of the Hexateuch with the name of Moses does not necessarily involve more than a fundamental Mosaic groundwork as the basis of the whole. Moreover, the Talmudic tra-

dition itself is (it is well known) of an obviously uncritical character, nor can it be said to derive much additional support from Christian antiquity. The chief Fathers of the Ante-Nicene age, with almost one consent, postulate a re-editing or possibly a complete redrafting of the sacred writings under Divine inspiration at the hands of Ezra in the Post-Exilic period. S. Jerome, the great scholar of the Post-Nicene period, to whose authority in such matters our own Church has given peculiar weight, discusses, in a well-known passage, the meaning of the phrase "to this day," as it occurs in the account of the burial of Moses, and in other parts of the Hexateuch. He clearly admits the difficulty of finally determining the date here referred to, which was, of course, that of the final composition of the books, in the following significant words: "Sive Moysen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Ezram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso."*

In the face of such authority as this, it would be difficult indeed to assert that the phenomena of the books themselves absolutely bound us down to the strict view of Mosaic authorship. In fact, the very character of the book

*Adv. Helvidium, sec. 7.

of Genesis suggests the use of original sources quite apart from the modern documentary hypothesis, whilst the clear evidence of the other historical books proves (if in the face of S. Luke's prologue any proof be required) that such composite character is in every way consistent with the fullest Divine inspiration.

The Books of Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy do, indeed, plainly assert the existence of accounts written by Moses himself of certain of the most remarkable events therein narrated, viz. : the war with Amalek in Ex. xvii., the legislation at Sinai contained in the Book of the Covenant, the stations in the wilderness journeyings, at least the legislative part of Deuteronomy, and the song in Deut. xxxii. The literary activity and development of the art of writing now known to have existed in Palestine long before the Mosaic period would have rendered the existence of such written Mosaic records most probable, even if nothing had been said about them ; whilst the mention of writing in these special instances, although not inconsistent with the subsequent Mosaic authorship of the whole, lends itself quite as naturally to the view of a later redaction. Nor, in view of the facts presented by the

Books of Psalms and Proverbs above referred to, does it seem safe to argue that the references to "the law of Moses" or "the Book of Moses," or the combination of these phrases, can be held to shut out the composite view, especially in the light of the statements of the early Christian writers.

A more difficult question, perhaps, is that involved in the New Testament citations, and especially in the words of our Blessed Lord Himself. Very strong statements on this head have been made by teachers of acknowledged eminence, to whom the utmost regard and reverence is due. To me it seems doubtful whether sufficient importance has been attached in this connection to those limitations of race and time involved in our Lord's true manhood, in that life under the Jewish law which He for our sakes voluntarily assumed; limitations which affected alike the scope of His teaching and the sphere of His work during the days of His suffering flesh, but which were done away in the glory of His Resurrection. Moreover, it seems by no means certain, from a careful comparison of the New Testament references to the Books of the Old, whether the words of Our Lord are meant to

carry with them the statement of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole any more than the phrases we have noted in the Old Testament. Even should we be mistaken in this, it would appear undesirable, in a case where legitimate doubt can be entertained, to preclude all examination into the matter by the appeal to our Lord's paramount authority; as in any event we may well believe that He Himself will, by His Spirit, guide the devout research of His servants to a sound and right conclusion in harmony with His own mind and will.

The conclusion, then, to which, if the foregoing be correct, we seem to be led, is that it is possible to sever the literary question from the various other issues, historical, philosophical and theological, and to leave its further examination to go on in the hands of devout and learned men undisturbed by considerations of its bearing upon those much more important matters. Or, to express the same thing in the words of a thoroughly conservative English theologian, Dr. Wace, "It is a matter of secondary importance, by what method, by what literary process, as it were, many of the books of the Old Testament were composed, provided it be acknowledged and

borne in mind that in the use of those literary methods the writers were controlled and guided by the spirit of God." *

It should be noted that this argument in no way deals with the literary question on its own merits, nor tends one feather's weight in its favour. As already hinted, the subject seems to bristle with unsolved, perhaps insoluble questions. The standpoint and object of the Redactor, for example, is a fundamental point of which no consistent and intelligible account has ever been given. The relation of the several narratives to each other, and of the whole narratives out of which the fragments incorporated in our Hexateuch were taken to those fragments themselves, with its important bearing on the "argument from silence," we must consider later. Then going still one step further back, there is the relation of the complete original documents to their primary source to be taken all into account. Add to these the initial difficulty as to the soundness of the literary method pursued and the possibility of attaining any reasonably certain results thereby (for which position we have the high authority of one who

* Paper before the Islington Clerical meeting. See Guardian, Jan. 24, 1894.

may, perhaps, be called our greatest English historian, the present Bishop of Oxford), together with the criticisms which may be passed on the actual application of the method itself in its several details. All these certainly constitute a formidable list of matters to be dealt with before the literary problem can be said to have reached anything like a final conclusion.

Passing now from the literary to the historical aspect of the subject, we undoubtedly come nearer to the root of the matter; and in dealing with the dates of the several documents and their relation to the other Old Testament books, we touch on issues which seem much more directly to affect the position of the Holy Scriptures, and the faith of Christendom in relation thereto. Yet, even here it will be well to carefully examine the nature of this relation and the extent to which it can be pressed.

It should be noticed then that the assigning of a comparatively late date to the final redactor of the Hexateuch, or to any of its component parts, is not in itself in any way inconsistent with its historical value. Green's History of the English People is not inferior in historical value to one of its original sources, although 1000 years or so later, while it may be,

and probably is, superior to some of them. A cursive MSS. of the New Testament is not, by reason of its late date, one whit less valuable than an uncial of the fourth century, although actual examination of the cursives generally may, from other considerations, render their inferiority the most probable hypothesis in any particular case. We may note, in this connection, that the great mass of critics, both present and past (with the exception of thorough-going adherents of the Grafian School, like Wellhausen) admit that the documents thus analyzed themselves rest upon older documentary sources. Wellhausen and Kuenen, with their immediate followers, stand practically alone on this point. In fact, if there is one matter upon which an almost unanimous consent of the critics can be predicted, it is as to the use of earlier documents in the sources known as P, J, and E. The unqualified statement of Professor Kirkpatrick that "these documents themselves had a literary history before they were welded together into our present Hexateuch;" and that "they were composed of existing elements, partly oral and partly documentary,"* or of Canon Driver, that even the document which is

* Kirkpatrick: Divine Library of the Old Testament, p. 46.

now placed latest in date P, "is based upon pre-existing Temple usage,"* and that its originality consists not so much in the institutions it describes as in the setting in which these are placed, only echoes the general position of the critics. Astrue and Simon, Eichorn, Ewald, Schrader and Dillmann, the younger German School represented by Strack and Kittel, all go behind the literary analysis to the earlier sources that underlie them. It seems quite safe, therefore, to assert that the tendency of sober criticism is both to modify the assigned dates of the documents of the Hexateuch, and to pass beyond these documents in estimating the historical character of the narrative to the far earlier sources—sources Mosaic or ante-Mosaic, it may well be, from which those documents were themselves drawn.

Thus, it appears that the cause of reverent Biblical study has everything to gain from the historico-critical study of the Old Testament. On the one side, Professor Robertson in his Baird Lectures, has shown abundant cause for the contention that the critics, particularly of the more revolutionary school, have been decidedly weak on the historical and philosophical

* Driver: Literature of the Old Testament, p. 135.

side,* and that there is therefore ample ground for carefully revising their work from that point of view; whilst on the other archæological research has lately thrown a flood of new light upon the contemporary history of the Old Testament period. The result has already been to remove many difficulties and to confirm the Biblical narratives in a very striking manner. It is indeed a most refreshing change to pass from the uncertain probabilities of the literary analysis to the solid ground of actual discovery. There were at one time indications of some jealousy on the part of certain critics of this new and fruitful method. A faint protest was raised by anticipation against what was called "an archæological reaction," but it is satisfactory to find that better counsels have prevailed, and that the critics now seem content to cordially admit the archæologists as co-workers with themselves in the Biblical field. Certainly the result so far of the fragmentary discoveries made has been to strikingly increase the evidence for the absolute "bona fides" and trustworthiness of the Biblical accounts.

* He summarizes his judgment in these striking terms: "The self-styled 'higher criticism' is, indeed, not high enough, or we should perhaps more appropriately say, not deep enough for the problem before it." Robertson: Early Religion of Israel, p. 473.

Thus, we now know that the Patriarchs moved to and fro in a society to whom literature and writing were perfectly familiar. The historical circumstances of narratives, like that of Gen. xiv, have, under the flood of light thus thrown on them, regained their living connection with the general history of the time. The same holds good of the parts of the Book of Genesis relating to the Egypt of the Patriarchal period, or to the history of the deliverance of the people from their later bondage. These results, most striking as they certainly are, probably form but the first gleanings of a rich harvest yet to come. They lend added weight to the opinion expressed by Lenormant, written before some of the most important of these discoveries were made, viz., that the question of documents is one thing, and that of date quite another, into which latter question considerations enter which do not belong to the exclusive domain of science: and then he adds, "Considering the question (i.e., of date) from the standpoint of pure science, apart from all religious prepossession, it appears to me to be still in suspense; and I do not believe it possible to arrive at a final solution, without taking into account to a greater extent than has hitherto been done the new

elements which Egyptology and Assyriology contribute to the problem." *

Nor should we shrink back and try to close the door against discussion, if the result of Cuneiform discovery has been to disclose to us a much closer correspondence than we imagined between the earliest narratives, like those of the Creation and the Flood, and the Assyrio-Babylonian literature. We may not have thought it probable that Almighty God would have chosen the common inheritance of tradition which Israel has received, together with the other Semitic races, as the earthly mould which was to contain the rich treasure of His Truth. But, should this be so, it would be but one reminder amongst many that God's ways are not as our ways, nor must we presume to measure them by our imperfect judgments. That these fragments of ancient thought on the great problems of being, recovered from the dust of so many centuries, should thus have been embedded in the firm rock of Divine Truth and in this shape made the common heritage of all the ages of faith, surely casts a light of special tenderness upon the manifold strivings of men after God amid

* Lenormant: "Les Origines de l'Histoire." Preface, p. xiv.

the thick darkness of heathendom, and stamps afresh upon the Church's very title-deeds the impress of her missionary character. As we now read those early portions of Genesis, they sound in our ears the warning so necessary in all our thoughts of missionary work. "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common." They add another strand to those constraining motives of love and obedience which impel us to press on in our high enterprise, to lift off the veil of error and of moral evil which now obscures the illumination of Him who is both "the light which lighteth every man coming into the world," and "the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe." As the present Archbishop of Canterbury said, in his strong, helpful way, four years ago: "The general course of criticism was aiming not at a denial of the supernatural, but at a new interpretation of it."* May we not add also a deeper realization of its loving, tender adaptation to the various movements and yearnings of our lost and sinful humanity.

Glancing now at the philosophical positions which underlie much of the critical works, is

* Address to Canterbury Diocesan Conference. See Guardian, July 16th, 1890.

it not, above all things, necessary that these should be clearly and sharply set forth by themselves alone, that so they may be considered upon their own merits and apart from the details of literary analysis? There are unquestionably philosophical assumptions underlying the writings of most of the German critics, and which largely colour all their work, with which the Christian Church can hold neither parley nor compromise. We can have no common ground, for example, with the standpoint of Kuenen, or Renan, or Stade, who degrade the religion of Israel from its lofty place as the Divine preparation for the Son of God, and attribute to it a purely naturalistic origin. We decline to entertain with Wellhausen, as a rational explanation of our sacred writings, an hypothesis which assigns to important portions of them an origin hardly distinguishable from fraudulent, and which strips them of all real weight. The complete "bona fides" of the sacred writers is a postulate which we feel amply justified in making, and a theory which necessitates the contrary assumption stands rightly condemned. The fruitful soil from which sprang the Christ, the writings which on every page witness for truth and righteousness with

passionate devotion, the institutions which prepared the way for the Christian Church, and which are associated with an unique moral and spiritual progress of humanity extending continuously over some forty centuries, these surely need no other argument to shield them from the aspersion of being cradled in sheer invention and fraud.

Nor less should we be on our guard against the exaggerated Hegelian position which substitutes the operation of impersonal tendencies for the work of great spiritual leaders, and postulates unreal antagonisms as the cause of abiding and beneficent spiritual progress.* No Christian would for one moment ignore the influence of "tendencies" acting on a wide scale upon nations or communities, or refuse to see in them an important factor in the Divine government of the world. But in spiritual things the law always holds good, that God works mainly, by the election of individuals fitted to originate great epochs of progress; and that a spiritual movement invariably begins to deteriorate when it becomes a

* This has been well expressed by Principal Fairbairn: "Impersonal tendencies were greater than conscious persons. Internal divisions and jealousies were forces weightier and more victorious than the enthusiasm of humanity." Christ in Modern Theology, p. 273.

tendency of the many or the property of the crowd.

To all these varied forms then of the naturalistic hypothesis the Christian may well reply in the words of the late Professor Jowett, one who was at least no prejudiced supporter of the supernatural: "When interpreted like any other book, by the same rules of evidence and the same canons of criticism, the Bible will still remain unlike any other book." * How else shall we explain its absolute uniqueness, its immeasurable superiority to every effort of human reason or aspiration of the human soul, but by the consistent answer of the Christian Church, that it enshrines a unique Revelation wherein the God and Father of us all has unveiled His glory to all generations of men. Yes, Christians rightly feel that the battle for the supernatural alike in the Old Testament and in the New has been fought around the personality and office of Jesus the Christ, and on the trustworthiness of the Christian writings. They know that this battle has not merely been fought, but that it has been won, and the Church is rightly impatient of any attempt to obscure the decisive issue by ir-

* Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture, section 3: in "Essays and Reviews."

relevant questions of uncertain analysis or dates.

Thus, if we are told that the conceptions of God in one Old Testament document are inconsistent with those in another, we can, without one moment's hesitation, appeal from the witness of the German scholar in his study to that of the countless multitudes of the saints of God. Spiritual things must ever be spiritually discerned, and spiritual appreciation is by no means universally a conspicuous quality amongst the higher critics. If our faith be true, then the Church is a spiritual body, in which the spiritual faculties of men are quickened and energized by the Eternal Spirit of God. And to claim that the ultimate verdict upon spiritual matters lies with that spiritual body, is simply to refer them to this appropriate standard of verification. Can we for one moment set the verdict of a few intellectual savants upon the highest of all spiritual things, the successive disclosures of the Personality of the invisible God, against the adoring and devout apprehension of the countless multitudes of Christendom? Let those who will, so do; but the issue rests in no manner of doubt. The adoring gaze of redeemed humanity will never cease to rest upon that Lord, who, age

by age, is gaining in increasing measure the admiration and unconscious homage even of those who reject His claim on their allegiance. A Christendom which is true to its Lord can never fail to recognize in that unique religious development out of which He sprang, a Divinely ordered preparation for His advent, or find in its fragmentary unveilings of God aught but a true and consistent progress towards that supreme goal. In the interests alike of faith and of a true philosophy, it will never hand over to impersonal tendencies the work of the great heroes of faith, or consent to blot out the names of the Patriarchs of Israel from the roll of the Saints of God. It will insist, and rightly so, that whatever conclusions may be drawn from literary analysis or historical research must harmonize with these central facts, which rest on foundations as secure as that of human reason itself. To quote the words of one of the greatest and most profound of German thinkers, Prof. Dorner: "It cannot be a postulate of historical investigation, that faith which is not the fruit of such investigation should *a priori* cease and determine. This would not further but injure inquiry." *

* Dorner: System of Christian Doctrine, Vol. II., p. 233.

In a word, in the interests alike of criticism and of faith our attitude of necessary suspense with regard to some of the literary and historical issues of Old Testament criticism must ever be conditioned by the full acceptance of the great words of our Lord, with all the consequences which flow from them: "ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν." *The Divine deliverance springs out of the Jews.*

II.

THE LITERARY ANALYSIS CRITICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

LECTURE II.

THE LITERARY ANALYSIS CRITICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

"*From a child thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.*" —2 Tim. iii. 15.

The history of Old Testament criticism may for the sake of clearness be divided into three periods. The first of these ends with Eichorn, the father of the modern critical methods; the second with Ewald; the third is that in which our own lot is cast. It may be well, in order to gain a broad and comprehensive view of the movement under consideration, very briefly to note the distinguishing characteristics of each of these three periods.

The rise of Old Testament criticism is usually traced to the questions raised by the Jewish Commentator, Abenezra, in the twelfth Christian century, and revived by Spinoza and others in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These questions centred round a small number

of passages which appear to imply a later redaction than the rest of the narrative; such as, "*And the Canaanite was then in the land*" (Gen. xii. 6); "*These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel*" (Gen. xxxvi. 31), or the narrative of the burial of Moses in Deut. xxxiv.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that such obvious matters were unnoticed by Christian antiquity, or that they had escaped the discernment of great Christian teachers. We have already noted St. Jerome's full discussion of the last-named passage from Deuteronomy; and his surmise that the words "*to this day*" referred to the time of the Redaction under Ezra. Nor was it merely to a great scholar like St. Jerome that such matters were familiar. Turn over the pages of St. Augustine's "De Genesi ad litteram" and you will find yourself in the midst of questions that to our ears sound strangely modern, yet which it is quite clear from the treatise were matters commonly discussed in the contemporary North African Church. The Christians of Carthage in the fourth century were familiar with differing views on such points as the

meaning of the days of creation, or the evolution in time of the various orders of created things; the nature of the seventh day of God's rest; the connection between the two narratives of the creation, and so on. Or if we descend to a somewhat lower plane of difficulty, we shall find in the "De Civitate Dei" or still earlier in the Homilies of St. Chrysostom, solutions of questions like that of the lack of information regarding Cain's wife, his building a city, and so forth. Nor, when in the course of a discussion we come across such golden sentences as these—"When one fails to understand, let him give honour to the Scripture of God, and himself fear;" * "Even where the details of Scripture cannot be fully investigated or made clear, at least (we can learn) that which a sound faith prescribes" †—can we fail to catch the spirit of humility and reverence in approaching the shrine of the self-manifestations of God which marks the devout student of Holy Scripture in every age. Whilst let us note also, this spirit is found in conjunction with a sympathetic and cordial

* "Ubi autem intelligere non potest, Scripturae Dei det honorem, sibi timorem."

† "Si autem et Scripturae circumstantia pertractari et discuti non potest, saltem id quod fides sana præscribit."

recognition of the claims of all truth, from whatever side it may happen to come, which we have been too prone to regard as a special mark of our own age.

Speaking broadly we may say that the "Recension Hypothesis" in one form or another, which we have traced back to the early Christian Teachers, remained the critical hypothesis to the middle of the eighteenth century; one school, represented by Fleury and Vitringa, still maintaining the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch with its subsequent Ezrahite revision; whilst Simon attributed it to the work of the Prophetical Schools making use of older documentary authorities. This latter point—the use of older documents—for example in Genesis—was conceded also by the defenders of the Mosaic authorship.

A new era opened with the proclamation to the world in 1753 by the French physician, Astruc, of the theory that the Book of Genesis was divided into "Sections" or "Memoirs" marked by the use of the two Divine Names Elohim and Jahveh, which thus distinguished the sources employed by Moses in the composition of the Book. The hint of the "Documentary Hypothesis" thus given was at once

followed up. Men turned with avidity from the barren controversies as to the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures and the date of its vowel points, which had engrossed the thoughts of the literary world for more than a century previous, to the new and attractive vista of investigation thus disclosed.

Eichorn's "Introduction to the Old Testament," published in 1780, expresses the natural result. The eleven Memoirs of Astruc now become two original documents, the Elohistic and Jahvistic sources respectively, upon which Moses drew in the composition of Genesis. The middle books of the Pentateuch also were the result of the combination of Mosaic documents; the Redaction dating from the Mosaic age, but with later glosses or insertions. Thus the science which Eichorn himself named "The Higher Criticism" was more than a century ago started on its way; and the main divisions of the present literary analysis, so far as the book of Genesis at least is concerned, outlined to the world. In the closing years of the century Ilgen discovered a third document, now called the "Second Elohist" in Genesis; but the hypothesis was forgotten until revised by Hupfeld some thirty or forty years since.

From that time it has become a recognized part of the critical position. Thus before the present century had opened, P, J, and E, as documentary sources of the Book of Genesis, were already separated in substantially their present divisions.

The "Fragmentary Hypothesis" of Geddes, which unsuccessfully disputed the ground for a time at the close of the century, requires but a cursory mention. It was soon felt that whatever the literary design of the Pentateuch, it was at any rate far more than a chance collection of fragments of early date loosely strung together in a subsequent age. Thus the "Fragmentary Hypothesis," as it is called, soon disappears from view; although the latest disintegrating results of criticism seem to come very near to its revival in another form. Such language as the following from Prof. Sanday's recent "Bampton Lectures"* describes a new "Fragmentary Hypothesis" almost as destructive of the real unity of the Books as the earlier and discredited one. Thus he tells of "copies" "passing often from hand to hand and enriched on the way by insertions and annotations;" of the "layers of gradual accretion

* Bampton Lectures for 1894. Pages 158–160.

which have gone to make the books which we now possess what they are;" or depicts to us, how, when "one hand laid down the pen, another, and in most cases a kindly and a friendly hand took it up, each working after a manner which had become traditional." It may be doubted, however, whether this explanation of the Old Testament Historical Books will have any better success in satisfying the mind of the twentieth century, than attended the theories of Geddes in the early years of the nineteenth.

Before entering upon the second period with the work of De Wette, from whom the "Fragmentary Hypothesis" received its final condemnation, and noticing the new turn of things which grew out of his strong protest for the unity of plan of the Books, it may be well to cast a glance backward at the position already reached.

Eichorn has been called by a recent English writer of the critical school "a dry German rationalist." This appears a somewhat ungrateful description of the father of the Higher criticism on the part of one of its advanced disciples. But granting that the epithet "dry" is hardly merited by a writer who possessed

undoubtedly much literary insight and power of historical discernment, still the fact remains that Eichorn was a thorough-going Rationalist of the eighteenth-century type, and that the task which he set before himself was to account for the facts of the Pentateuch, whilst explaining away its supernatural side. Thus, to distinguish between the different aspects of Divine Revelation implied in the two Names of God, was a matter of but little moment in his eyes. The Names served as convenient sign-posts to mark off the hand of one writer from that of another, and this was enough.

This tendency to ignore the meaning or origin of the Names themselves (whilst using them as aids to an artificial division), which was so natural from the standpoint of the eighteenth-century Rationalists, seems to have survived largely down to the present day.

Canon Driver, for instance, tells us of the preference of P for the Name Elohim; but he gives no explanation of the phenomenon.* J, the Jahvistic source, we are informed, emanated from the kingdom of Judah, and E

*Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. "For such a variation in similar and consecutive chapters no plausible explanation can be assigned except diversity of authorship." p. 11.

from Northern Israel,* for the not very conclusive reason apparently that E makes the patriarchs worship at the sacred shrine of Northern Israel, whilst "J displays a large hearted interest in the myths and sacred places both of Israel and Judah." † Or, as Mr. Addis puts it—"His (the Elohist's) stories of the patriarchs centre round the shrines and sacred places of Northern Israel." "Hence," continues Mr. Addis, "though there is much dispute about the place in which the Jahvist wrote, there is a general consensus of critics that the Elohist belonged to the Northern Kingdom" ‡—verily, a cogent argument, which needs to be stated only to produce conviction!! So far as I know, no one attempts to explain *why* the Northern writer should habitually use the name Elohim, and the Southern, Jahveh. M. Renan, indeed, propounds a theory which is clear cut and simple. According to him, Elohim is the God of the Patriarchal period, and Jahveh the

* Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 115.

† Canon Driver admits that "the grounds alleged may seem to be slight in themselves, but in the absence of stronger grounds on the other side, they make it at least relatively probable that E and J belonged to the northern and southern kingdoms respectively." p. 116.

‡ Addis, Documents of the Hexateuch, Introduction, p. 55.

national deity of later times.* From all which we should conclude that the two Elohistic documents P and E (in Genesis) have reproduced the history of the Patriarchal period in its contemporary dress, and that J, in which the later name of God is used, represents the subsequent Redaction. Yet nothing could be more at variance than this with present critical conclusions.

It would seem, therefore, that if the choice of the Divine Names in the two documents can be explained neither from their date, nor the locality in which they took their rise, it must depend either upon Theological considerations involved in the Names themselves, or must be dismissed as purely arbitrary. The latter alternative appears to be generally adopted by the critics ; and it is therefore impossible to avoid attaching the idea of a certain artificiality to a division which is thus made. Then, when the documents have been ascertained by this means, the guide who first pointed out the way is comparatively ignored, and the burden of proof, so far as the division is concerned, laid

* "Notre opinion est que l'Elohisme patriarchal doit être conçu comme antérieur et supérieur au Jahvéisme." Renan, Histoire du Peuple d' Israel, vol. i. p. 65.

upon independent differences of style and vocabulary. Yet, as every one knows, the argument from such differences is proverbially uncertain. Moreover, there are not wanting passages in which it is difficult to see any reason for the analysis other than the use of the Divine Names themselves. (Compare for example, Gen. xxix 31—xxx 24, the narrative of the birth of Jacob's children.) When we bear in mind that the change from one Divine Name to the other occurs in exactly the same way in other parts of the Bible, and yet, has never been held in those sections to indicate any difference of authorship; (take the 19th Psalm as a familiar example) and the further fact that in a large number of cases the choice of Name is without doubt made advisedly in accordance with the subject matter: (e. g., in conversation with a non-Israelite, Elohim is used, not Jahveh), it would certainly be more convincing if the occurrence of the Names in the several documents were not so purely arbitrary. Under these circumstances, too, there seems no necessity for endeavoring to explain the occurrence of the wrong Name of God in certain places in P and E: twice in P, xvii 1 and xxi 1^{b}, and four times in E, once in a com-

pound (המריה) in xxii 2 and absolutely in xxii 11 and xxii 14 (twice). It seems unnecessary, I say, to attempt with Canon Driver to account for this as being the work of the "compiler" or "even a scribe," who subsequently made the substitution "under the influence of the usage of the verses preceding." * If the only explanation that can be given of the use of the Sacred Names in J on the one side and in P and E on the other, is the simple one that so it is, it becomes hard to see why the same reason should not be adequate to explain the disregard of the use in these instances, or, in fact, any other possible phenomenon. The truth is, that this arbitrary division of the Names of God between different documents is a legacy of the Rationalistic origin of the literary analysis, and constitutes an *a priori* difficulty of some weight against a full acceptance of its accuracy.

But to return to the history of the critical movement and trace the second period of its development. The work of Astruc and Eichorn was carried still further by De Wette. De Wette was the first to place the composition of Deuteronomy, or rather of the "kernel"

* Introduction, p. 20.

of Deuteronomy, in the days of Josiah. He also made a vigorous onslaught upon the historical character and fidelity of the Books of Chronicles, which he regards as transformed in the Levitical interest and holds much of its sources to be entirely legendary and unhistorical. These points have, with more or less modification, remained important bases of the critical position down to the present day. It is difficult to avoid associating them at least in their origin with De Wette's own personal history, with his loss of faith in the supernatural through the influence of the great Rationalist Paulus, which was followed at length by his recovery of religion through intercourse with Fries and Schleiermacher; with both of whom religion was rather a matter of the heart than of the head, and to whom all religious feeling must be true, even though its intellectual expression might be false. Moreover, Schleiermacher, who was De Wette's sheet-anchor in religious matters, attached little or no value to Judaism as the precursor of Christianity. It seems probable that De Wette would at least have modified some of his positions (which even Canon Cheyne admits to be too extreme), had he possessed a less one-

sided religious adviser. Very pathetic are the words in which De Wette sums up the result of his life-work, confessing the failure of its results to satisfy the ideals of a sincere high-minded soul. "I have sown the seed," he says, "but where is the harvest now ripening? I lived in a troubled time, the union of believers was broken. I mixed with the struggle, but it was in vain. I have not succeeded in making it cease."* A striking illustration, I would venture to assert, of the inevitable failure of Rationalistic Pietism in all ages to meet the spiritual needs of men.

De Wette's strong condemnation of the "Fragmentary Hypothesis" prepared the way for the work of Bleek and Ewald; who, to account for the unity of Genesis, put forth what is known as the "Supplementary Hypothesis." According to this view, the second of Eichorn's two documents (called by these critics JE) occupies a position like that of the Fourth Gospel. It was written expressly with the view of supplementing the omissions of the previous account. Thus, the original Elohist was supplemented by the later and more de-

* Lichtenburg, History of German Theology in the 19th century, p. 445.

tailed Jahvistic writing. The division adopted by Ewald is the same in principle, although it ultimately became more complex. He, too, engrafts upon his Elohistic "Book of Origins," which he says was compiled from ancient sources in the Solomonic period, successive supplementary accounts J and E. Ewald put back the date of the composition of Deuteronomy from the reign of Josiah to that of Manasseh, and postulated two redactors; one, who combined P, J, and E, and a final redactor who made some further additions and brought the whole to its present state.

The complexity of Ewald's analysis was soon felt to detract from its value, although modern scholars have gone far ahead of him in this respect. But his deep sense of God, his unfaltering reverence for the religion of Israel as a unique manifestation of God to the world, coupled with his keen sympathetic insight, will always maintain for him a position of the first rank amongst German critical scholars. In his true reverence, as well as his fondness for broad abstract impersonal conceptions, Heinrich Ewald was cast in much the same mould as our own Frederick Denison Maurice. We cannot fail to trace the spirit of Maurice in the

vivid portraiture which Canon Cheyne has preserved of the great German teacher pointing two English visitors to the Greek Testament with the remark, "In this little book is contained all the wisdom of the world:"* or, in his indignant protest against the "so-called criticism" "which has given up Moses and so much that is excellent besides," and which "leads on directly to the contemptuous rejection of the Old Testament, if not of the New."† That Ewald's faith was less complete than Maurice's in some important particulars, is probably due rather to his less fortunate environment, cut off as he was from the organic unity of the Catholic Church, than to any essential difference of spirit.

Schrader, in 1869, put forth Ewald's analysis in a simpler and more attractive form by dispensing with the two redactors. The Jahvist writing in N. Israel in the time of Jeroboam II. becomes (according to Schrader) at once the redactor and the supplementer of J, E, and P, each of which had used earlier sources. The Deuteronomist is also the final redactor, who both wrote that book and added it to the rest.

* Cheyne, Founders of Old Testament Criticism, p. 115.
† *Ibid.*, p. 107.

Schrader is now better known for his later work on the cuneiform inscriptions as illustrative of the Old Testament history than for his directly critical hypotheses.

So far, then, as we have yet gone (with the exception of De Wette and allowing for the Rationalistic standpoint of Eichorn,) the path of criticism has kept true to the main position held by Astruc at the first. It has aimed at reconciling the critical analysis with the historical trustworthiness of the dissected records, and has postulated in these throughout the use of earlier materials. Moreover, it has uniformly assigned priority of date to the less graphic and more formal Elohistic documents, and placed later in time the pictorial and flowing supplement of the Jahvist.

The time was now at hand when both these positions were to be completely abandoned. The Elohistic document was henceforth to be dethroned from its position of superior antiquity and historical pre-eminence, and to be relegated instead to an origin of unconscious mythical idealization, or, as the more thoroughgoing exponents of the new theory would not hesitate to say, of conscious and fraudulent invention. The new Pentateuchal controversy

begins. Its first postulate is the complete reversal of the main results of the older criticism which gave it birth.

The first note of the coming storm was given by Hupfeld, who, in re-discovering Ilgen's forgotten second Elohistic document, had brought forward assumed antagonisms between the two narrators, similar to those so much in vogue at the time in the current criticisms of the New Testament records. The immediate object of Hupfeld was to show the untenableness of the "Supplemental Hypothesis." But his application of the Tübingen methods to the Old Testament was soon to be made on a far wider scale and with correspondingly startling results.

The "Development Hypothesis," as it is called, has reached its full form under the hands of Wellhausen and Kuenen, who worked out in detail and with great power the positions of Graf and Reuss. But the whole theory can rightly be understood only when it takes its place, in company with the New Testament criticism of Baur and Strauss, as an ultimate result of the Hegelian Philosophy. As Principal Fairbairn truly says: "In Germany every speculation has its corresponding theological

tendency and crisis," * and the remark holds good in the present instance. In fact the same year, 1835, which saw the publication of Baur's "Die Christliche Gnosis," and of the original edition of the "Leben Jesu" of Strauss, was marked by the issue of Vatke's "Biblische Theologie," in which, avowedly from the Hegelian standpoint, he contended that the order of development of the Israelitish Religion had been wrongly apprehended, and that henceforth Prophetism and Mosaism must change places. A similar position with regard to the Sacrificial and Priestly legislation of the Pentateuch had been reached almost simultaneously by Reuss; as he claims intuitively, but the intuition was probably conditioned by the prevailing philosophy.

It is true that the strong currents of parallel thought which we have thus traced back to a common date and origin, were to run a strangely different course in the domains of the Old and New Testament criticism respectively. The decades which witnessed the rapid development of the school of Baur in its reconstruction of the New Testament history, were not those in which the "Tendency Hypothesis" was des-

* Fairbairn: Christ in Modern Theology, p. 205.

tined to achieve its triumphs in the Old Testament field. For a time it seemed as though the theory in its Old Testament application was still-born. Vatke retracted his position, and for long decades the school of Bleek and Ewald held the field successfully against all comers. Strangely enough in the case of movements so closely connected in origin and date, the period of sterility in the Old Testament application of the theory was coincident with that of full growth and maturity in the similar treatment of the New Testament; whilst the rapid decadence of the Tübingen theories was quickly followed by the resuscitation of the similar method in the sphere of the Old Testament. "Paulinismus" and "Petrinismus," "Particularismus" and "Universalismus" with their corresponding developments of antithesis and subsequent synthesis had had their brief day. The unexpected discovery of piece after piece of Sub-Apostolic literature had "planted one nail after another in the coffin of the Tübingen theory" as soon as their full consequences were discovered. In this work of inestimable importance, the two great Cambridge scholars, Westcott and Lightfoot, deservedly took the first place. Hardly

had Dr. Lightfoot concluded that famous series of articles* which forever destroyed the hold upon England of the Tübingen attack by his masterly demolition of the book known as "Supernatural Religion," when the publication of Wellhausen's "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" in 1878, began an attack in force of the old foes upon a new part of Divine Revelation.

The discredited antagonism between Petrine and Pauline parties was again reproduced in an assumed struggle between the supporters of the "high places" on the one side and of the "central sanctuary" on the other. A vivid picture was drawn of the Levites generally who ministered at the country sanctuaries, engaging in unequal conflict with the sons of Aaron who served at the Royal shrine at Jerusalem, and soon sharing the fate of the vanquished. Once again we have antagonistic tendency writings, Deuteronomy and P on the one side, J and E on the other; with the later conciliatory document in the Chronicles which, it was asserted, (just as had been said of

*Originally written for the Contemporary Review, but since republished under the title of "Essays on Supernatural Religion." Macmillan, 1889.

the Acts in the New Testament) swept away all trace of the struggle by a false appeal to antiquity.

The resuscitation was as complete as that of the dead mariners in the sweet fancy of the poet, who tells how :

> "They groaned, they stirred, they all uprose
> Nor spake, nor moved their eyes.
> It had been strange, even in a dream
> To see those dead men rise.
>
> "The helmsman steered, the ship moved on
> Yet never a breeze up-blew.
> The mariners all 'gan work the ropes
> Where they were wont to do."

Of course, it is not pretended that all this decides the matter. The evidence is quite distinct in the two cases, and so must its examination be likewise. The arguments of Wellhausen are based upon a new set of phenomena, which must receive as full and searching examination as was given to those of the Apostolic history. The theory is, I repeat, entitled to, and it must receive, the same exhaustive investigation that was given to its other self. It cannot be laughed out of court as if the issue in its first essay were decisive in

the new encounter. But neither on the other hand can it shake itself free from the just stigma of that first crushing overthrow. These assumed antagonisms lack the virility and ease of their New Testament counterparts. They flit uneasily across the stage as if half conscious that they are but the ghosts of their former selves. Once again history seems to be repeating itself. The successive discoveries of the Didache, of S. Clement's Epistle in its full form, and of the Diatessaron, with the flood of light they cast upon the actual facts of sub-apostolic history, are being paralleled, in the all-wise Providence of God, by the marvellous unveiling of the contemporary history of the Old Testament period which is now going on beneath our eyes. Nor can we doubt that as in the case of the New Testament so also here, the ultimate result will be to awaken in the Church a more intelligent and living appreciation of the Old Testament dispensation, as with quickened eyes and mind we earn again the lessons of its wondrous history. So may the sequel of the sweet lay of Coleridge find its analogue here also :

' Twas not those souls that fled in pain,
Which to their corses came again,

But a troop of spirits blest.
For when it dawned, they dropped their arms
And clustered round the mast,
Sweet sounds rose slowly through their mouths
And from their bodies passed."

We may note here that already the theory in its first clear cut outlines shows signs of disintegration. Dillmann still in the main adheres to the position of his great teacher Ewald, and assigns to P a pre-Exilic date. Schrader, from Archæological grounds, arrives independently at the same conclusion. Schultz, who assigns J to the reign of Solomon and E to the early years of the Northern Kingdom, makes P to be the work of a priest in the Exilic period itself. The most recent critical school, represented in Germany by Strack and Kittell, in England by Prof. Driver, as has been already noticed, regard P as in the main a codification of existent pre-Exilic and ancient usage, with its roots, at least, stretching back to the time of Moses; so that the unique portions of P alone belong to the Exilic or post-Exilic period and even so represent a development growing naturally and vitally out of long existent priestly usage. Unquestionably, as was mentioned in the first Lecture, the com-

plex nature of the legislation of P is being increasingly conceded by recent criticism; and the issue is thus narrowed down to the date of the full completion and development of Israel's institutions under the guidance of God, not to that of the origination of the institutions themselves. Critics like Prof. Briggs acknowledge that "Law and Prophecy are not two distinct and separate modes of revelation, but the same"; * a position clearly irreconcilable with the fundamental thesis of Wellhausen, as stated in his Prolegomena, that "there is between them all the difference that separates two wholly distinct worlds." † There is no mistaking the fundamental position implied in the words with which Prof. Briggs closes his recent volume on "The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," as follows:

"The deeper study of the unity and variety of the Hexateuchal narratives and laws, as we defend their historicity against Reuss, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, and advance in the apprehension of their sublime harmony, will gratify and enrich the theology of our day, just as the deeper study of the unity and variety of the Gospels . . . . . in the defence of them against Strauss, Renan, and Baur,

* Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, p. 161.

† Prolegomena, Introduction, p. 3.

has been an unspeakable blessing in the past generation." *

So much time has been spent on this historical résumé that but little opportunity remains for anything like an independent examination of the critical positions themselves. Much of this must therefore be postponed to a later lecture. Still, the time will not have been ill spent, if I have been able to show the causes which historically underlie the chief critical positions, and the intimate connection which exists between the religious and philosophical environment which they reflect and those main conclusions themselves: and then flowing out of the connection thus established, the consequent essential link between the Old Testament problems and the New; between the issues which still hang in the balance and those other main questions concerning the New Testament, which, speaking generally, may now be taken as finally and certainly determined. If I mistake not, the battle is half-won when the position and strength of the opposing forces are thus accurately gauged.

Before bringing this lecture to a close, however, I may perhaps venture on a short criti-

* Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, p. 162.

cism of two fundamental points. One affecting the literary analysis in general, and the other the "Tendency" theory of the Wellhausen school.

First, then, as to the artificial character of much of the analysis itself. Few people, I think, who will give the time to mark out for themselves in a Hebrew or for that matter in an English Bible, the divisions of the Hexateuch (as given for example, in Canon Driver's Introduction), will not experience a strong, *a priori* repugnance to a dissection often so minute, and in many cases apparently so arbitrary. It is not merely that narratives, or even verses, are cut up piecemeal fashion in defiance of what seems the closest connection, and the fragments distributed in their mutilated state between the several documentary sources; but that (even if we postulate the division) it is so difficult to premise the intention of the Redactor in selecting such disjointed fragments from his original sources. The process of dissection is not usually attractive to persons of keen sensibilities, whether literary or otherwise, but the repugnance may entirely disappear if the purpose to be attained is reasonably clear. Where no adequate purpose

can be seen the repugnance is with most people exceedingly strong.

Take for example such a verse as Gen. xxi. 1: "*And the Lord visited Sarah as he had said, and the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken.*" In spite of the repetition of the same sacred Name, the first half of this verse, "*And the Lord visited Sarah as he had said,*" is assigned to J, and the second, "*And the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken*" to P. Presumably this is done, partly because of the duplication of the same idea in the two clauses, and partly from the necessity of finding headings for each of the assumed parallel accounts which follow.

Now, let us assume that all this is correct, and that the division corresponds to the fact. Then see what follows. The Jahvistic document by hypothesis already contained the clause, "*And the Lord visited Sarah as he had said.*" What then should induce any redactor to insert in his own composite narrative almost identically the same thing from P and join the two clauses thus together? Is it contended that the two clauses are not identical? If so, what is the difference between them? Had P added anything to the previous account it

would all have been natural enough, but, as the two clauses read, the assumed action of the Redactor appears very hard indeed to understand. Of course, the critical theory required the combination of two parallel narratives, and so, as noted above, the verse had to be divided to supply a heading for each. The more natural explanation would seem to be that we have simply a somewhat redundant parallelism, such as is common in Hebrew and other Semitic literature, whether Poetry or Prose. This view does not, however, fall in with the required critical conclusion, and is dismissed unnoticed.

As instances of such parallelism take for example the common versicles:

> "*O God, make speed to save us.*"
> "*O Lord, make haste to help us.*" *

Or in prose.

"*And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up.*" † From the narrative of Creation.

Take another instance. In Gen. xxxi 17 18

* Taken from Ps. lxx. 1. † Genesis ii. 5.

we have an account of Jacob's return from Paddan-aram as follows:

"*Then Jacob rose up, and set his sons and his wives upon the camels; and he carried away all his cattle, and all his substance which he had gathered; the cattle of his getting, which he had gathered in Paddan-aram for to go to Isaac his father unto the land of Canaan.*"

This passage occurs in the midst of a long extract of 40 verses as to Jacob's stratagem about the cattle and his interview thereon with Laban, all of which criticism asserts to have been taken from E. But unfortunately, the word for "substance" רכוש and the geographical term Paddan-aram, are words which are uniformly assigned to P. Accordingly the last clauses beginning "*with all his substance*" are torn away from the rest of the 40 verses and set down to P's account. Now, assuming once more that this is correct what would be the object of the Redactor in inserting out of an assumed parallel narrative from P this one little formal statement? The one distinguishing point in which, is, by the way, assumed in the subsequent dispute which arose over Jacob's theft of Laban's household gods. Or again take Gen. xxv 26. In this narrative of

the twin sons of Isaac we have the following:

"*And after that came forth his brother, and his hand had hold upon Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob; and Isaac was three-score years old when she bore them. And the boys grew,*" and so on.

What would seem more natural than this note of time giving the father's age at the birth of his sons? Yet because it is a critical postulate that dates belong to P this clause is severed off as P's contribution. As though the Jahvistic writer who is assumed to have composed this work in the palmy days of Hebrew literature did not know the Hebrew for "Isaac was 60 years old," or knowing could not have used it. Moreover the use of the Kal בלדת for the Hiphil בהוליד which would be much more natural in P's assumed narrative seems to point the other way. It is not then, I repeat, merely that the dissection often seems microscopic and piecemeal, but that it is so difficult to realise the reverse process by which "ex hypothesi" the narrative actually reached its present form.

Take another point. Look at some of the assumed excerpts from the several documents in their mutual relation as they must have once

stood in those original documents themselves.

Here are three consecutive fragments which are said to come from P:

"*And Laban gave to Rachel his daughter, Bilhah his handmaid to be her handmaid.*" Gen. xxix 29.

"*And all his substance which he had gathered, the cattle of his getting, which he gathered in Paddan-aram for to go to Isaac his father, unto the land of Canaan.*" Gen. xxxi 18.

"*And Jacob came in peace to the city of Shechem; which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Paddan-aram.*" Gen. xxxiii 18.

It seems inconceivable that these passages could have stood in close connection in P's narrative, and very difficult to see how they were originally strung together save by a narrative like that of Genesis itself. We may note also in passing that the first passage is so clearly postulated in J's subsequent narrative (xxx 4) as to make its insertion from another document seem unlikely, whilst the second passage has already been examined above. For instance of similar difficulties of connection compare from P.

"*And all the men of his house, those born in the house, and those bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him.*" Gen. xvii 27.

The next passage from P is :

"*And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the Plain, that God remembered Absalom, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in the which Lot dwelt.*" Gen. xix 29.

Both the construction and the subject matter make it very difficult for us not to regard the last verse as the final summing up of a narrative like the existing account in Genesis ; but because of the Name of God used and the occurrence of a word assigned to P it is affirmed to be taken from that source. Why should the Redactor trouble to extract from P's narrative this mere formal recapitulation of what he had already fully described?

Now compare passages from J :

"*And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.*" Gen. vii 12.

"*And the Lord shut him in. And the flood was forty days upon the earth,*" *etc.* Gen. vii 16.

Clearly the intervening context of J must have contained the account of Noah's entrance into the Ark exactly as in Genesis, but all this is said to be taken by the compiler from P.

Again, take these passages:

"*And Jacob went out from Beersheba, and went towards Haran.*" Gen. xxviii 11.

"*And behold the Lord stood above it;* (or him) *and said, I am the Lord, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac.*" Gen. xxviii 13.

Clearly some intermediate narrative like E's in verses 11 and 12 is necessary if we here try to reconstruct J.

It would be easy to multiply similar examples from the middle books of the Pentateuch, perhaps even more striking than these, but time forbids. I must therefore content myself with the examples already given and throw out this hint of a method for further investigation, of which some may possibly care to avail themselves.

Our examination of the literary analysis then seems to shut us up to one of two conclusions. Either P J and E were originally parallel documents closely resembling each other, after the fashion of the first three Gospels, or the analysis hopelessly breaks down. This analogy of the Synoptist Gospels may help to confirm our conclusion from an independent point of view. As against the objections to a piecemeal and microscopic analysis so naturally

raised, at least on the first blush of the matter, the critics have referred triumphantly to the example of the Diatessaron of Tatian recently brought to light. See, say they, an example of the very thing you are objecting to. Analyze the Diatessaron into its known elements as you have them in the Canonical Gospels, and you must treat it in precisely the same fashion as we have treated the Book of Genesis. The plea is undoubtedly valid up to a certain point. There certainly is a striking general resemblance between the process of resolving the Diatessaron into its component parts, and that with which we are familiar in the critical treatment of the Pentateuch. Of course this would not show that the Pentateuch was actually thus built up, but it does away with the antecedent improbability of the method from its being found applicable in a parallel case.

In a *parallel* case. Precisely. But then, mark the consequences which flow from assuming the Book of Genesis to be thus parallel in its structure to the Diatessaron. For the Diatessaron is no ordinary compilation. The very possibility of forming such a harmonistic treatise depends upon a certain relationship be-

tween its original sources. Three of these are known to be strictly parallel to each other, and rest back upon a large amount of common matter which each reproduces with almost verbal accuracy. The fourth source has exactly the same general outline, but is intended to supplement the other three. Moreover, Tatian had a special object in view. He wished to combine in one consecutive narrative all that the four sources contain, and so to supersede (as for a time in some Churches he actually did) the use of the four separate Gospels.* Now, bearing in mind the peculiar relationship of his sources, as well as the special object of the work, we do certainly find in it phenomena of most striking similarity to those of the critically dissected Genesis. Let any one write out in colored ink the parts of the Diatessaron which come from each Gospel, and he will obtain an almost startling counterpart of the variegated Pentateuch under similar treatment. There will be, for example, exactly the same irregularity in the distribution of color. Large sections of one color will alternate with a succession of mosaics in which the coloring is almost as complicated as

*See Theodoret, Hær. Fab. Comp. i. 20.

the solar spectrum. If we now proceed to examine the two sets of passages in which these different phenomena occur, we shall find that the long excerpts of one color correspond to those parts in which S. John (we will say) preserves sections entirely lacking in the other sources (take the great discourse in S. John vi., as an example), whilst the short fragmentary pieces occur in the parts where the sources had material largely common to them all, as in the narrative of the miracle of the 5,000, which introduces the discourse above mentioned.

Now, when it is borne in mind that P in Genesis is, with the exception of larger sections such as those in Genesis i., v. and xvii., mainly composed of these short disjointed fragments; the analogy of the Diatessaron forces us to this most important conclusion, viz., that P in its original shape was a document for the most part containing the same material as J and E except in a few of its unique sections. Thus, if we find that P in the fragments preserved is silent about any point mentioned in the intermediate narrative of J and E, so far from this arguing that P did not contain this matter originally, or was ignorant on these points, all

the evidence constrains us to the exactly opposite conclusion. The "argument from silence" is as completely reversed as in the well-known case of the New Testament notices in Eusebius. The method of Bp. Lightfoot's famous article on the "Silence of Eusebius" is exactly applicable to the "silence" of P. In a word, P's "silence" on any point in the greater part of Genesis is certain evidence that this point formed part of the original P from which the fragmentary quotations were subsequently made. Thus if in Genesis, as we are told by Wellhausen, P speaks of no altars erected by the Patriarchs, no offerings brought, and in fact no sacrificial act prior to the time of Moses, while J and E do record these things ;* all this only renders it practically certain that P's account was just like that of J and E in these important respects. The "silence" of P demonstrates its knowledge not its ignorance, as certainly as the "silence" of Eusebius with regard to any particular New Testament writing, so far from telling against it, only shows its acknowledged reception.

* Prolegomena, p. 54. "The contrast with the Priestly code is extremely striking, for it is well known that the latter work makes mention of no sacrificial act prior to the time of Moses."

The precariousness of the "argument from silence" has of course often been pointed out. The confident use which is everywhere made of it in the critical literature appears to argue an amount of daring hardly justifiable under the circumstances of the case. But, unless the preceding investigation is radically unsound, it follows that the results so gained are not merely precarious but become absolutely worthless and wrong. Whilst upon the validity of these results, be it remembered, practically hangs the whole "Tendency Hypothesis."

Not to dwell further upon this vital point enough has at any rate been said to justify the contention that the question of the literary analysis is very far indeed from being closed. The same method has been applied to the Homeric writings, where no theological questions come in, but has failed to produce general acquiescence in its results.* A great Western historian, Bp. Stubbs, doubts whether it can be ever applied with a reasonable amount of certainty; while a distinguished Orientalist, Prof. Sayce, protests that even if applicable to Western histories it is entirely out of place in regard to ancient Eastern records. The

*See Appendix G.

"literary tact of a modern European" he holds to be "worthless when it is exercised on the Sacred Books of the East," * or again, he says: "The accuracy of language and expression demanded from the sacred writers was mathematical in its exactness; it was an accuracy which could not with fairness be demanded from any ancient writer, more especially one whose home was in the East." † We shall see directly that in cases where the analysis can be tested by comparison with the cuneiform records, the result is distinctly unfavorable to its accuracy. As, for example, in the case of the narratives of the Creation and the Flood. Even where it may be assumed to rest upon a basis of fact, we have already shown how uncertain are many of the conclusions which have been drawn from it.

To summarize then our results so far. Whether we consider the critical conclusions from the point of view of their mutual divergence, of the philosophical presuppositions by which they were historically conditioned, or the methods by which they are attained; these separate lines of investigation all seem to con-

* The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 557.
† *Ibid.*, p. 21.

verge to one and the same result. If, as a great master in spiritual things has lately said, we must not seek to "withdraw one document which helps to define our faith from the operations of any established law of criticism;" * neither must we ignore the correlative fact, not merely that as the same master teaches "no historical inquiry can decide that there is no revelation," † but also that in the present condition of things there are scarcely any important conclusions of literary criticism applied to the Pentateuch which we can safely take to be finally decided, whilst many of them are open to the gravest doubt. Other critical theories again, like the revolutionary views which distinguish Kuenen and Wellhausen from our best English scholars, may be for all practical purposes put out of court.

For most of us it would seem that the weighty obligation and high privilege of moulding the life and character of our generation by means of the sacred writings of the Old Testament must be discharged under conditions not greatly changed from those in which a similar service was rendered to men in the generations that are gone; and that we may with sure

* Westcott, Gospel of Life, p. 92. † *Ibid.*

confidence and reverent diligence follow humbly in the steps of the great teachers who have preceded us, in applying to the needs of the flocks committed to our charge those same "*sacred writings which are able to make* them *wise unto salvation*," and to build them up *a holy temple in the Lord*."

III.

THE CREATION AND PARADISE.

LECTURE III.

THE CREATION AND PARADISE.

For of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things. To Him be glory for ever. Amen.— Rom. xi. 36.

For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. . . . For ye are all one in Christ Jesus.— Gal. iii. 26–28.

A great master in theology has happily summed up the office of the opening chapters of Genesis as furnishing a preface to Holy Scripture by bringing out the three fundamental conditions which render all revelation at once possible and necessary: That "the world was made by God," and therefore "in all its parts is an expression of the will of God;" a real revelation in the varying measure of its several orders of His Divine Glory. "That man was made in the image of God," and is therefore "capable of holding fellowship with Him," and so susceptible of as unique a rational, moral, and spiritual development.

That man had "by self-assertion broken his rightful connexion with God," and thus "for the fulfilment of his destiny" now "needs the help of God, not merely for his growth, but also for his restoration." *

These are "the three postulates of Religion," † as Dr. Westcott calls them, which underlie the whole subsequent course of Revelation.

"*So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.*"

These "postulates" are expressed in language and imagery so simple that even a child can appreciate them, yet are so deep and far-reaching both in themselves and in their consequences that they form a true "Gospel of Life."

To quote once again:

"They lay down irrevocably the essential relations of God, and man, and the world. They go back to a point beyond all experience. The final sanctions of every noble form of human activity, the promises which illuminate the 'toppling crags of duty,' are implicitly contained in them. . . . They show that the conception of humanity as a living whole is not a dream but a truth. They show that the aspirations of man to God answer to his essential constitution and contain the pledge of fulfilment. They

* Westcott, Gospel of Life, pages 183, 184. † *Ibid.*, p. 199.

show that the sinfulness by which he is bound and the sins by which he is stained are not parts of his real self, that they are intrusive and that so they can be done away." *

In a word, they place the abiding facts of human existence in their right "connexion with an unseen order," they form in themselves, "rightly apprehended, the primitive Gospel of the world." †

All subsequent revelation is but the working out of the consequences which already lie implicitly contained in that primary message. The new creation of men in Christ Jesus our Lord, what is it but the loving confirmation and renewal in the abundant mercy of God of the hopes that lie there already latent and in germ? The most glorious revelations of the Gospel, the office and work of our Lord in relation to humanity, the supernatural powers and energies of the Church inspired by the Eternal Spirit working through the living Word and Sacraments, the blessed rest with Christ of the faithful departed—all these are the exact counterparts of this initial revelation, and hence we find them often clothed in Holy Scripture in imagery drawn therefrom. Think

* Westcott, "Gospel of Life," p. 197. † *Ibid.*, p. 186.

of the closing visions of the Apocalypse: "*The city which lieth four square* where *they need no light of lamp, neither light of sun;* for the *glory of God did lighten it and the lamp thereof is the Lamb;* into which *there shall in no wise enter anything unclean;* but *amidst the light* whereof *the nations shall walk and the kings of the earth bring their glory with it.* So that *they that wash their robes may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.*" These last voices of inspiration in all their wealth of imagery and beauty unsurpassable, what are they but the final confirmation in the great love of God of the plan imaged forth in the narrative of Creation, the assurance of its ultimate triumph, all appearances notwithstanding, the reversal of the sentence of our expulsion, the perfect realization of the conditions foreshadowed in the first Paradise, the fulfilment surpassing all imagination of the counsel of that God who said: "*Light shall come out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ.*"

Yes, it surely needs no further proof that the lessons thus given in this "preface" to all revelation are primarily moral and spiritual

rather than merely physical and historical. They underlie all existence, all life, all service, all hope. They form the charter of humanity, the defence of its nobility, the revelation of its destiny, the gospel of its hope. "No criticism," as Dr. Westcott truly says, "can rob them of their sublime majesty and pathos,"* nor, we may add, detract one iota from their spiritual greatness, their abiding importance to all the generations of men.

Before passing to consider the narrative itself in the light of these primary considerations we should perhaps refer for a moment, in order to dismiss the matter further from our thoughts, to what the same high authority already quoted calls the "flood of irrelevant controversy"† which has gathered round the first chapter of Genesis.

One of my distinguished predecessors in the office of Paddock Lecturer, Bishop Hugh Miller Thompson, with all that brilliancy and fire of eloquence of which he is so accomplished a master, has already dealt with this subject in his opening lecture on "The World and the Kingdom." He has so clearly and forcibly expressed my own position that I am

* Westcott, "Gospel of Life," p. 187. † *Ibid.*, p. 185.

relieved from the necessity of doing more than quoting one or two sentences from that work. As the Bishop justly says with regard to much literature of this sort: "It was a literature at which both religion and science were at their weakest, and men were trying to apologize to the finder of a flint arrow-head or a human skull" (or, we may add, a fossil), "for their belief in Almighty God and eternal righteousness, and the awful mystery of human life; a literature only to be compared with its opposite, that in which every experimentalist who had discovered a new microbe or a new chemical compound felt himself at once qualified to declare the throne of the universe vacant and himself capable of explaining and accounting for all things seen and unseen. Such literatures will be curious studies in psychology to the men of the twentieth century." * Anglican theologians must have digested to little purpose, I will not say the teachings of the great Fathers of the undivided Church, but the argument of our own judicious Hooker, if they ever suffered or encouraged scientists to assume that the primary object of the narrative of Creation was to give a scientific account

* "The World and the Kingdom," Paddock Lectures for 1888.

of the sequence or evolution of the different forms of life, so that a great scientist of to-day can still think of that sublime prologue to all revelation as a fence placed across the path of scientific investigation. That all this should have been even possible shows how bitter has been the Nemesis which has overtaken us for the past neglect of Patristic, or for that matter of Theological study which was so common, alas, before the spread of the great Oxford movement. A more Catholic theology would assuredly have guarded men from the snare of regarding the sublime prologue of Genesis as a sort of advanced copy of a monograph on Geological Biology three thousand years before its time.

S. Augustine states it as a commonplace that the object of Holy Scripture is "to teach men things of which they ought not to be ignorant, yet cannot know of themselves." Again and again he insists that the "days" in Genesis have a causal, not a temporal, significance ; * in a word, that they represent a state, not a span. S. Chrysostom reminds us in several places that we must recognize in the form of the historical narration an "accommo-

* De Genesi ad Litt., i. 33, ii. 28, iv. 25, 32.

dation of the merciful God" unfolding "the order of the things that were made" and how "each was brought forth," * an accommodation which he contrasts with the brevity of the corresponding part of the prologue of S. John's Gospel. "The son of Thunder," he says, "does not proceed in this way" (of historical narrative) "when the human race had advanced in virtue, but leads on to more lofty teaching." S. Gregory of Nyssa again tells how Moses sets before us doctrine in the form of a history ἱστορικώτερον καὶ δι᾽ αἰνιγματών.† All these

* Homilia in Gen. iii. 2 (ed. Gaume, p. 21). ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς διὰ τῆς τοῦ προφήτου γλώττης παιδεύων τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, εἰδέναι τῶν γινομένων τὴν τάξιν, καὶ τίς ὁ τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς, καὶ ὅπως ἕκαστον παρήχθη. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ, ἔτι ἀτελέστερον διέκειτο τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο τῶν τελειοτέρων συνιέναι τὴν κατανόησιν, διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀκουόντων ἀσθένειαν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὴν τοῦ προφήτου γλῶτταν κινῆσαν οὕτως ἅπαντα ἡμῖν διαλέγεται. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι διὰ τὸ ἀτελὲς τῆς ἡμετέρας διανοίας ταύτῃ ἐχρήσατο τῇ συγκαταβάσει τῆς διηγήσεως, ὅρα τὸν τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸν, ὅτε πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐπέδωκε τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, οὐκέτι ταύτην ἐρχόμενον τὴν ὁδὸν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν διδασκαλίαν ἄγοντα τοὺς ἀκροωμένους. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος κ. τ. λ.

† Oratio Catechetica c. viii. (p. 33 ed. Migne). S. Gregory is commenting upon the "coats of skins" in Gen. iii. The whole passage is as follows: "Τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον δόγμα ἱστορικώτερον μὲν καὶ δι᾽ αἰνιγμάτων ὁ Μωσῆς ὑμῖν ἐκτίθεται. Πλὴν ἔκδηλον καὶ τὰ αἰνίγματα τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἔχει."

representative Fathers emphasize the thought that however full of instruction the details of the narrative may prove to be, and probably the Church has not yet penetrated to their full significance, yet they must ever remain strictly subordinate to the great fundamental postulates of all religion which they enshrine, the primary lessons of which they illustrate and develop. S. Thomas of Aquin only sums up the verdict alike of religious common sense and of the truest historical theology when he says that Holy Scripture speaks "in the language of the people," "secundem opinionem populi."* In other words, that part of the accommodation implied in the very nature of a revelation is that it will be couched in the tongues of men; that both its message and its form will be relative to the needs of humanity as a whole, to the necessities of man as man, not to the speculation of savants in this nineteenth Christian century. As of old the message will come home to each man in the tongue wherein he was born. We shall be disappointed, therefore, if we go to it for enlightenment on matters of no spiritual moment whatever, for knowledge of a kind which the light of reason implanted within us is ade-

*Summa., 1ª 2æ q. 98 a. 3 ad 2m.

quate to enable us gradually to discover. A careful study of the first chapter of Genesis, under the guidance of S. Augustine or S. Chrysostom, will make it clear that the various details of the Divine History have nothing in common with any scientific investigation of an extinct fossilized world; that when we read of herbs and trees, of fish and fowl and land animals, we are meant to think of the corresponding living things as we know them in this present age and state; of those things which man all around was preventing to his own degradation by idolatrous worship, and which are here traced up in orderly sequence to the hand of the living God.

Or, to go one step further, we are to see here the Divine antidote to that idolatry of created things which is always with us, and is none the less deadly in civilized America to day than in the days of the savage red man, although it does not now cloak itself in the outward garb of idolatrous worship; the Divine vindication of man's true office in the midst of sentient and inanimate Nature to represent in it the authority and the character of God, to be a co-worker with the Creator in bringing its unconscious service into a deeper harmony, in secur-

ing the consecration of its manifold treasures by the free offering of a self-conscious spiritual nature. S. Chrysostom, in his Homilies, clearly states * that a chief office of Genesis I. was to wean man from idolatry ; and it is significant in this connection to notice the emphasis there laid upon the light, the bright sky, the mighty waters, the fertile earth, the sun, moon, and stars, the trees or the living animals, all of which were actually objects of false worship, common among the Semitic or Egyptian peoples, by whom Israel was surrounded. As S. Augustine truly says, it is in the power which it has to mould human character after the likeness of God, that the supreme proof is to be found, that the Church possesses the true interpretation of Holy Scripture,† and whatever has little or nothing in common with this supreme aim may safely be left to be deduced from other sources than the Holy Scriptures. The first chapter of Genesis then had primarily in view the triumph of Israel over the idolatry of heathenism. It still makes for the ever-growing victory of the faith of Christ over the manifold temptations which assail man through his relation to the world without him.

* In Gen. Homilia, II. 2 (ed. Gaume, p. 14). † De Gen. ad Litt., I. 40.

From this standpoint it is of great interest to note the connection which recent archæological discovery is revealing between the inspired record of Genesis now under consideration and the cosmological conceptions (perverted as they for the most part were to idolatrous uses) which were then current—conceptions by which Israel was during the greater part of its history actually surrounded. Imperfect and fragmentary as our present knowledge no doubt is, for the whole science is but a thing of yesterday, yet the light thrown upon the long-buried treasures of the East in the writings of men like George Smith, Schrader, and Sayce, have made it abundantly clear that a real connection (whether it be direct or, as is much more probable, indirect) exists between these early chapters of the Bible and those ancient relics of a long-buried world. The cosmological conceptions which the Patriarchs probably shared in common with their fellow Semites are thus made the earthly vessel in which is to be poured the rich treasure of a unique and special inspiration. Just as the humanity of our Blessed Lord was fashioned by the supernatural act of the Holy Ghost from the substance of the Virgin Mary,

His mother, so it would seem that by a similar Creative act the Revelation which was to be adequate for all time was fashioned from the rough elements of human thought, built up together to form the chosen shrine of the deepest and highest truth. It can but call forth our devout adoration and deepen our reverence to trace in this fair work of God the marks indisputable and deep of its derivation on the human side, if only we approach the matter from the standpoint of the Catholic Faith. As in the mystery of the Incarnation, so also here, we have need to pluck our shoes from off our feet, for we are drawing nigh to a Divine presence, the ground on which we tread is holy ground.

Let us beware in this matter also of the twin and subtle errors which correspond to the Nestorian and Eutychian views of our Lord's Incarnate Person. On the one side we must be on our guard against the tendency which shows itself in a loose, lax view of the vital and unbroken connection existing from first to last between the human and the Divine in Holy Scripture, so that men are content to explain each part of Scripture on a purely human basis, and then postulate its Divine character as a

kind of after-thought; an addition to that which was humanly complete before, rather than as the fashioner and builder of those very human elements themselves. And on the other hand we must never refuse to look the "human" facts in the face, or expect, like Eutyches, to find the Divine so interpenetrating the human as to leave no true human element there at all. Rather let us take for our watchword on this subject also the great motto of Chalcedon:

ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως.

Throughout Holy Scripture we must confess both a true human and a true Divine element vitally and indissolubly united in the living Word, yet so that all which is truly human still abides glorified and transformed, but never losing its proper human characteristics. The religious and intellectual environment of our own day is hardly such as to dispose us Anglo-Catholics to Eutychian views on the matter; but we have undoubtedly much need to be on our guard against the Nestorianism which is so rife in the present age and yet is so subtle in its nature and in its approach.

Each act of inspiration is a vital assimilation

of the human into a living fellowship with the Divine, not a mechanical combination of the two ; whereby not merely is the human element purified and made meet for its Divine work but the qualities thereof are enlarged to the fulness of their capacity. Hence comes the inexhaustible fulness of Holy Scripture, the wealth of its application (so striking in comparison with any other book) with which every true priest is familiar. To argue about Holy Scripture as though the human element in it were the whole, seems as certain to lead us into serious error as if one were to write a treatise on the habits and movements of living things based on the postulate that they were subject to no other law than that of gravitation.

But to return to the Babylonian records.

It is clear from the fragments which have been already discovered, that from very early times cosmological questions played an important part in Babylonian thought and literature. It is, moreover, probable that from Babylonia they passed into Greece, as the physical speculations of the earliest Greek philosophical school seem to have decided affinities with the cuneiform documents. Be this as it may, we possess two main Babylonian accounts of the origin of

things. These are evidently closely connected by some common ties, yet stand widely differentiated from each other, both in date and form. The earliest of them goes back to Sumerian times, and was found in a bilingual form (like the Codex Bezæ for example), the original Sumerian with an interlinear translation into Semitic Babylonian. The later, which is also much the longer account, dates in its present form from the seventh century B.C. It forms part of a library of extant Babylonian literature, copied by order of the great monarch, Assurbanipal. We must not, however, conclude therefrom that the account itself is necessarily, or even probably, of so late a date. The brick records expressly state that the collection thus made embraced the whole then extant literature belonging to various historical periods. Most unfortunately this collection has reached us only in an imperfect state. A good part perished in the overthrow of Nineveh. Enough, however, has survived to tell of the existence of several versions of the story of Creation, large portions of one of which have been pieced together and deciphered. Thus we are enabled to compare this longer Creation epic, which bears abundant marks of

later expansion in the theological direction, with the early Sumerian account. The accounts in full may be conveniently read in Prof. Sayce's recent book, "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments."

The earliest document uses the idea of the Creation as a setting for celebrating the praises of the great temples of Chaldæa, and of their chief and most ancient cities. Then we read in reference to the great temple at Eridu :

"The glorious house, the house of the gods in a glorious place, had not been made;

"A plant had not been brought forth, a tree had not been created;

"A brick had not been made, a beam had not been formed;

"A house had not been built, a city had not been constructed;" *

and so on.

Here follow the names of various cities and temples which had not been built, and lower down the reference to Eridu is repeated.

"The deep had not been made, Eridu had not been constructed.

"As for the glorious house, the house of the gods, its seat had not been made.

* Sayce, "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 91.

"The whole of the lands, the sea also had not been formed.

"When with the sea the current was,

"In that day Eridu was made," etc.

"Babylon was built," etc.*

This is followed by an account of the making of the gods and the spirits of the earth, after which comes fresh praise of the dwelling-place of the gods, the making of which is ascribed to Merodach, the Sun god. Then we are told

"He made mankind.

"He made the beasts of the field and the living creatures of the desert.

"He made the Tigris and Euphrates, and set them in their place." †

Here follows in somewhat confused fashion mention of the making of specified plants and animals of the field and of the forest.

Venerable in point of antiquity as this document unquestionably is, its strong local colouring, its lack of order, and its evident aim to celebrate the glories of Assyrian architecture, make it probable that it does not represent the Creation poem in its original state, but an adaptation of the original form to this special

* Sayce, "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 92. † *Ibid.*

purpose. The second line, which bears strong resemblance to Genesis II. 5, seems uncomfortably farced between the different references to the Temple at Eridu ; whilst the seat of the gods is represented as a magnificent building, an image which has no point of contact with the Hebrew narrative.

The longer epic seems to represent a more direct cosmological tradition. In its present form it contains pretty obvious expansions, such as the long narrative of the conflict between Merodach, the Sun god, and Tiamat, the representative of darkness, disorder, and chaos. Its opening tablet has striking resemblances to the Biblical account of both P and J. Thus, for example, it incorporates the isolated verse which was noticed in the Sumerian document as so strikingly parallel to J's narrative in Genesis II. 5. Here are some of its important parts :

"When on high the heavens proclaimed not,
"And earth beneath recorded not a name;
"Then the abyss of waters was in the beginning their generator,
"The chaos of the deep was she who bore them all.
"Their waters were embosomed together (i.e. covered everything),

"The plant of the field was ungathered, the herb (of the field) ungrown.

"When the gods had not appeared (any one of them),

"By no name were they recorded, no destiny (had they fixed);

"Then were the great gods created·"

and so on.

Then follows a list of chief deities by name. After a considerable gap, in which the record is mutilated, we have a long account of the war between Merodach and Tiamat and of the part which different gods took therein. Finally, Tiamat is slain. The result of this victory of the god of light over darkness and chaos is the restraining of the waters so that

"The sky is bright, the lower earth rejoices," etc.

The firmament, which is compared to a great building (not as in the Old Testament to an expanse), is established and made the stronghold in the heavens of the great gods. Then follows the account of the fixing of the habitations of the great gods in the different parts of the sky, the ordaining of the year subject to the signs of the zodiac, three stars for each month, the founding of the mansion of the sun god, the illumination of the

moon god to be the watchman of the night, etc. After a considerable gap in the record we pass to the creation of the beasts, the monsters, the living creatures, cattle, and creeping things by the great gods in their assembly. The primal monsters were destroyed and their place taken by the present animal creation.

The remainder of the epic is lost, but the narrative of Berossus, who three centuries later, in the time of Alexander the Great, wrote an account of the literature of his people, is in such general accordance with the chief contents of the epic that it becomes possible to approximate with considerable probability to the substance of the missing sequel. It probably contained some account of the formation of men who, according to Berossus, were produced by the action of one of the gods mixing the earth with the blood which flowed forth from the head of Bel.

Unquestionably these relics of the far-off past, these voices from a civilization which once covered the known world with its literature, present striking points of contact with the Book of Genesis ; but they present even still more striking points of difference. It is not merely that, as Prof. Sayce puts it, "In passing from the As-

syrian poem to the Biblical narrative, we seem to pass from romance to reality;"* or as Prof. Jastrow, another leading Orientalist, says: "In distinction from the greatness of the former the latter sounds like a nursery tale."† Not merely that the child-like mythology of the cuneiform inscriptions has given place to the stern monotheism and elevated spirituality of Genesis, but that, as we shall notice more in detail presently, there is a whole world of moral and spiritual idea contained in the brief words of Genesis, which is entirely wanting in the heathen records. The former is not simply a magnificent revelation of God the Creator; it is also the great charter of humanity, the pledge of the abiding fellowship between God and man, and of the ultimate accomplishment of man's high destiny thereby. The one document holds within itself the secret of the regeneration of the world; the other is but a venerable and curious cosmological conceit.

Yet such considerations must not blind us to the undeniable resemblances with the Genesis account which these documents present—resemblances so strong as to force upon us the

* "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," pp. 77, 78.

† See the Century Magazine for January, 1894.

conviction of some connection, direct or indirect, between them. Even the apparently truncated Sumerian poem has resemblances both with the Jahvistic and the Elohistic narratives (note the detail with which plants and animals are described), but this is still more obvious in the longer epic, particularly in the opening verses, where it is startling to find the opening sections of both P and J combined in one organic whole. To quote Prof. Sayce: "Different as the two accounts of the creation may be they are united in the cosmology of Babylonia."* When we take account of the known fact (guaranteed by the Assurbanipal tablets), that the story of Creation existed in many forms (adapted probably to various ends), and then of this other fact, that in the two utterly distinct forms in which it has actually reached us the main common elements combine material both from the Elohistic and Jahvistic accounts; we may infer with considerable probability that the main features, both of Gen. I. and Gen. II., of P and of JE were combined in one common cosmological tradition of the Semitic ancestors of Israel.

*"Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 83.

For it is most improbable, as some of the critics have supposed, that this fundamental groundwork was derived from Babylonian sources in the times of the monarchy or in the days of the exiles. The character of the mythological records, as we know them from the almost contemporaneous tablets of Assurbanipal, makes it practically impossible that any Hebrew prophet, any successor of Hosea and Amos, of Isaiah and Micah, would select these complicated myths of the hated Chaldæans to form the groundwork of a supplemental narrative of the Creation. Fancy a prophet of the Isaianic school with his heart full of burning indignation against Babylonian idolatry, with the very protest of the last part of Isaiah against the gods of Babylon ringing in his ear, endeavoring to prune down the mythological fancies of that long epic of Assurbanipal into the magnificent simplicity of Genesis I. The situation is inconceivable. Knowing, as we now do, how the cuneiform account had expanded with the growth of time, it becomes infinitely more likely that the original elements of the Creation story were the common Semitic original of both the Biblical and the cuneiform records, than that the former was consciously cut out

from the cuneiform in anything like their contemporary development.

Moreover, as has been often noticed, there are some positive indications of weight to be taken into account in the determination of the matter. Some, at least, of the material of the Jahvistic account had long been in the possession of Israel. The very fact that Paradise is placed in Babylonia is absolutely inconsistent, not merely with an origin in the Exilic period, but in any period of the monarchy from the time when Assyria had begun to loom upon the distant horizon as a threatening military power. The mention of the fig tree in III. 7 points strongly to a distinctly Palestinian standpoint, that being a common tree in Palestine and Egypt, but not in Babylonia ; as also do the confused and apparently insoluble geographical details as to the position of the Garden of Eden. We conclude, therefore, confidently that it was from Babylon, regarded as the mother of literature, not from Babylon, the mistress of the nations or the haughty oppressor that the ground stock of cosmological conceptions was derived which is embodied in the inspired narrative.

This result is in exact agreement with the historical picture which we now possess of the

universal diffusion of Babylonian thought and letters, both in Egypt and in Palestine, in the pre-Mosaic period. The discovery at Tell-el-Amarna of the actual archives and state correspondence of the Semitic rulers of Egypt before the period of the Exodus, has revealed the existence of Babylonian literary influence over the people of Western Asia, so widespread that it has revolutionized all our conceptions of the contemporary history. Such a statement as that of Schultz, when he speaks of the Hebrews as living in "a state of primitive simplicity as regards culture" * while in Egypt, is now utterly disproved by the actual records of the time, and with it therefore falls to the ground his whole argument against the preservation in Israel of the Chaldæan wisdom of their ancestors. Civil-service schools existed in Egypt for training pupils in the Babylonian tongue and literature. It is probable that the sons of Joseph were familiar with these in their Egyptian home, and it seems certain that the previously dominant literature cannot have so suddenly disappeared

* Schultz, "Old Testament Theology" (T. and T. Clark, I. 106): "That a pastoral people like the Hebrews could, while living in Egyptian bondage and in circumstances of primitive simplicity as regards culture, have retained in their memories for centuries the wisdom of the Chaldæans is an idea that bids defiance to all historical probability."

as that Moses, who was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," can have been ignorant of it; whilst it is hard to believe that the recollection of what was everywhere around their ancestors in the Patriarchal period should have died out from the minds of their descendants. Rather the probability grows on us, as we for the first time apprehend the true situation, that Moses, when leading the people into a land where in its polytheistic and mythological development they would be surrounded on all sides by this ancient Babylonian wisdom, should have under Divine inspiration furnished his people with the necessary defence, in the conversion of that wisdom itself to the confirmation of their faith in the true God: just as the Apostle S. John in the end of the days similarly made the current philosophical conceptions of the Logos the groundwork of the doctrine of the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, and thus laid the foundation of the Church's victories in the next century, by giving the necessary starting-point for the development of all later Christian theology.

But, it may be urged, the effect of all this argument is to contradict or to ignore all the ascertained results of criticism as to the sep-

arate origin of the two Creation narratives. It may be well, therefore, to consider this point in the remainder of this lecture.

Let me say, then, frankly at the outset, that unquestionably the fundamental assumptions of the literary criticism, particularly in reference to the Book of Genesis, must be entirely re-examined in the light of the recent discoveries of Tell-el-Amarna. Here, at any rate, if not generally, the critic has, in the words of Prof. Sayce, "made his own ignorance the measure of the credibility of an ancient document." * The historical postulates on which the critical estimate of a narrative such as Gen. I. rested have been absolutely swept away, and hence, even if the literary analysis be still accepted, at least the current critical conception of the value and date of the documents must be profoundly modified.

But I unhesitatingly go further than this. The current analysis itself seems to me to have given far less weight than is due to the essential connection between the narratives, or to the strong bands set deep in the subject matter itself, which knit them together. Prof. Briggs has summed up in convenient

* "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 16.

iorm what he considers the points of difference between the two narratives, which render it impossible to conceive them to be the work of one author. President Harper in "Hebraica" sets forth the same positions and in somewhat less delicate fashion. Similar arguments are used by the critical commentaries generally.

To begin, then, with the alleged differences in the representation of God's creative work. In one account we are told He "creates" by speaking.

"He is conceived as a commander of an army, summoning His troops for review, line upon line, until they all stand before Him an organized host." *

In the other God "uses His hands in creation."

[By the way, how does Prof. Briggs know this? It must be from some other source than our text of Genesis.]

"He plants the Garden of Eden as a gardener," etc.†

Now, put shortly, this amounts to saying that according to the two accounts God is represented in the one case as creating by a word, in the other as fashioning through means. We ask in the first place, why not? Why should this difference be anything more than the two com-

* Briggs, "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 75. † *Ibid.*

plementary sides of the picture which must be combined to obtain a full view of the whole? Apply the same test to the Gospel narrative. Is not our Lord stated by the same evangelist at one time to have healed the sick of the palsy by a word, at another to have given sight to the blind, only by taking him aside privately, by putting his fingers into his ears, by spitting and touching his tongue? and does any one assert that the difference proves S. Mark to have here combined two distinct and separate portraitures of the Lord originating in different conceptions of His method of working? Surely this converting of complementary truths into contradictory antitheses outdoes the perverse ingenuity even of our wildest modern sectaries. But further, the contrast is far more sweeping than accurate. We read only three times of a Creative act—in the origin of the heavens and the earth generally,* in that of sentient life, † and in that of rational and spiritual existence amongst men. ‡ These are the three occasions in which the word בּרא is used. But just the same number of times in Gen. I. we have the word עשׂה, "to make," occurring, the use of which in the second account is

* Gen. i. 1. † Gen. i. 21. ‡ Gen. i. 27.

said to be in accordance with the usage of J elsewhere and of all the earlier writers. Thus, we are told, *God made the firmament, God made the two great lights, God made the beasts of the earth after his kind.** The same word occurs as a synonym with בָּרָא in the words "*Let us make man,*" which are followed by the statement: "*So God created man in His own image.*"† Thus the actual facts fail to bear out the assumed antithesis. It is true that we have Divine Words mentioned in Gen. I., but so have we also in Gen. II., *e.g.* in v. 18, where we read "*the LORD God said, It is not meet that man should be alone;*" introducing the narrative as to the formation of woman in exactly the same way as the analogous Divine Word in the first chapter.‡ If any modern critic is superficial enough to imagine that the conception of the Creator, actually pronouncing the words in empty space, exhausts or represents the essential meaning of the corresponding narrative, let him be put to school with S. Augustine or let him learn to graduate in the school of common sense. Clearly by the Divine Words we are intended to understand the correspond-

* Gen. i. 7, 16, 25. † Gen. i. 26, 27. ‡ Gen. i. 26.

ence of the various orders of creation in their several conditions of being with the Divine volition, as exerted through the agency of the Eternal Word of God. The character of Gen. II. does not require any comparison of the several orders of existence; but whenever the narratives are parallel an exactly similar usage occurs to that in the other account.

A similar remark applies to the difference pointed out between the creative energy of the Holy Ghost, represented as hovering over the original chaos, and what Dr. Briggs calls "God's breath proceeding from the divine nostrils into the breath of the creatures,"* [where does he get this from?] "imparting to them the breath of life."

Surely it is clear to the dullest comprehension that Gen. II. is occupied with man and his development, while Gen. I. deals with creation generally, and that there is not the smallest warrant for asserting that God breathed into the nostrils "of the creatures." That Divine act applied to man alone, and is thus an exact analogue of the unique position assigned to man in Gen. I. 26. That two images should be used, one to represent the Divine energy in its

* "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 76.

communication to physical nature, and another to shadow forth the unique donation of spiritual and self-conscious rationality to man, appears most natural.

If we pass to the next head adduced by Dr. Briggs, we find him still unfortunate in his reproduction of the simple words of the Bible. He tells of "a rainless ground without vegetable and animal life"* set before us at the outset of the Jahvistic narrative, which he contrasts with the "abyss" of Gen. I., but he omits to mention that although the ground was "rainless" it was not, therefore, as we might be led to infer, dry, but that a constant vaporous mist was going up from its surface, a condition of things not far removed from the picture of the first account. So again we are told that in the first account six orders of creation appear instantaneously on the mornings of six creative days. Why not on the evenings? we might ask, or has the exact hour been fixed in some edition of the text not accessible to ordinary mortals, the special property of the critics? This fundamental misapprehension of the significance of the "days" largely vitiates the subsequent arguments as to the differences of the order of Creation. Thus in contrast

* "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 76.

with Gen. I. Dr. Briggs recounts, shall I say complains, that the "great luminaries" are in Gen. II. left out of consideration. We may add, too, the formation of light, of the bright firmament, of the seas, and the living things which swarm in them; omissions sufficiently large, one would think, to render very improbable the supposition that we have here a separate complete account of the Creation. We are then given as an order of Creation in the second narrative the following: (1) Adam, (2) trees, *i.e.* presumably, the trees of the garden, (3) animals, (4) Eve. Now it seems hard to believe that an impartial person reading the narrative of Gen. II. without any critical prejudication, can fail to see that we have here no independent order of Creation at all, but a supplement containing some back references and intended to teach three fundamental conceptions:

(1) Man's high position (conceded even by the cuneiform writers) as in a unique sense proceeding from the hand of God, and made in His image.

(2) The nature of the environment with which God surrounded him and the relation in which he stood to it.

(3) The due relations between the sexes which form the basis of human society; the sanction given to marriage in the original Divine purpose, as alike indissoluble in its character, and as a fellowship extending into the higher psychical and spiritual sphere.

As a foil, so to speak, for this last conception, the writer recounts again the formation of the beasts, and emphasises man's inability to find in them any fitting counterpart. It is interesting in this respect to notice that the original narrative of Gen. I. only in the case of man adds the statement, "male and female created He them;"* as though preparing for the thought to be expanded subsequently, that in the case of man the obvious distinction of sex received a new office and consecration. In regard to the building up of the rib into a woman, we must bear in mind S. Chrysostom's caution, that such revelations are an accommodation to our weakness, and that the actual methods of God's created working must always transcend human thought.† As-

* V. 27.

† Homilia in Gen. xv., page 140 (ed. Gaume). *ὅρα τὴν συγκατάβασιν τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς ὅσοις ῥήμασι κεχρηται διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν.* . . . as to the manner of Creation, *μόνος ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὁ τὴν δημιουργίαν ἐργασάμενος.*

suredly we may see here, as the Patristic writers do, not merely the lesson of woman's original dependence deduced by S. Paul, but also the protecting consecration given to woman's whole office in the reproduction of the race; the needful reminder that the accustomed laws of human generation are but the gracious sharing of God's Creative power, in the way He Himself has ordained; that they are in no sense necessary channels within which that power is shut up, save by the loving condescension of God himself. Like the Virgin birth of our Blessed Lord this narrative is as a shield of purity standing at the very threshold of Revelation.

At this point we may notice the force of the double Name "the LORD God," which occurs in Gen. II. III. only in the Hexateuch, and very rarely elsewhere in the Old Testament, reappearing once again in the closing chapters of the Apocalypse. It is customary among the critics to assume that the occurrence of this sublime name is due to the Redactor, who wished thus to bind together the Elohistic narrative of P with that of J. Truly a lame and unmeaning explanation, even if it should turn out to be the best that can be given. But the usage of the Old Testament sug-

gests that this double Name of God exactly corresponds to the later title, "the LORD God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Jacob," or again, "the LORD God of Hosts," or "the LORD God of Israel." The solemn absolute form seems here used to emphasize the relation of the Eternal, the God of Israel, to all races of men and to all created beings.

An argument has been based upon the non-occurrence of reference to the details of Creation in the pre-Exilic books, but this is easily met (as Prof. Sayce does*) by pointing to a similar non-occurrence in the post-Exilic books also. It is interesting in this respect to remark that Ps. CIV., which is clearly a reproduction in verse of Gen. I., entirely omits the "days" whilst retaining the classification of the original source. It would prolong this lecture unduly to notice further S. Augustine's unanswerable reasons for regarding the "days" thus passed over in the inspired commentary of the Psalter, not (as they must be on the popular interpretation) as the cardinal hinges of the whole narrative, but as representing the differing bounds or limits of the Divine self-communication which correspond to each sev-

* "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 82.

eral order of creation, and out of which the next highest takes its beginning. Thus the "days" correspond not to a sequence of time, but to a sequence of order which exists through all time in the mutual relations of the creation itself. This interpretation derives great strength from an accurate translation of the original so as to read with the Revised Version, *and there was evening and there was morning, one day*—instead of the familiar words of the earlier Version, *and the evening and the morning were the first day*. It thus becomes clear that the intention of the Sacred Writer was rather to define a "day" than to mark a note of time. *The evening* and *the morning*, as the etymology of the original words suggest, correspond to successive stages of the advancing light ushering in the full day. The nature of *the seventh day*, which must in accordance with the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews be regarded rather as a continuous state than a limited duration of time, points strongly in the same direction. The spiritual lessons of abiding value in their bearing upon human activity and its inner consecration in the spiritual life, which lie enshrined in the several "days," may be studied in the pages of S. Augustine; or

will be found traced with great beauty and insight in a too little known modern book, "Man's Great Charter," by the Rev. F. E. Coggin.*

Enough has perhaps been said to form a reasonable foundation for the conclusion, that whatever may be the literary history of the venerable documents of Genesis I. and II., they are now bound together by spiritual and essential ties, in a close union which it is our great loss if we fail to recognize or strive to part asunder. The order and harmony of Creation, as its several parts are fashioned in obedience to the loving will of God and receive His gracious benediction as *very good*, constitutes the very revelation necessary to sustain human hope and to keep alive human reverence, in prospect of the mystery of evil recorded in Genesis III. The Eden of Genesis II. is the special application of Genesis I. to man's own nature and environment, whether natural or social, and is equally necessary to give us hope in view of the deadly influence of our present environment with which we are but too familiar. In the second chapter also we have a revelation of the character of God complementary, necessarily com-

* See Appendix.

plementary, to that of the first. Not now so much God in His essential majesty, but God in His condescension to humanity, is brought before us. To separate these two aspects, and to ignore the latter, is the fundamental error of Mohammedanism; in fact, of all monotheistic systems which do not centre in the Incarnation.

In a word, to recognize the true relationship between these accounts is to possess the necessary preparation alike for the deepest revelations of God, and the highest conceptions of life. To tear them asunder is to inflict upon mankind serious spiritual loss. To lessen in any way their influence is to cut at the very root of all true progress either in the knowledge of God or the regeneration of man.

IV.

THE FALL AND ITS IMMEDIATE RESULTS.

LECTURE IV.

THE FALL AND ITS IMMEDIATE RESULTS.

"*For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.*"—Romans v. 19.

We have noticed in our consideration of the first two chapters of Genesis the design of the sacred narrative to lay deep the foundations, not merely of faith in God, but also of that which is ever for us the correlative truth, the spiritual dignity and higher life of man.

The brief summary of Gen. i. 26, as interpreted and expanded by the subsequent narrative of the second chapter, has taken root deep down in the hearts of men, and formed there that special conception of Humanity which is characteristic of the Faith of the Incarnation; viz., that man, because possessing unique moral and spiritual endowments is therefore capable, upon the basis of those endowments, of growing up by the power of a

divine fellowship into a fixed character like to the character of God. Not merely, as we said, is the spiritual life of men traced back to a gift proceeding directly from God, but it grows up under the influence and power of a conscious Divine fellowship, while for its sustentation and perfecting it rests back upon a Divine gift of energy and power. These great and fundamental truths, which Evangelists and Apostles have in the light of the Incarnation inworked into Christian thought, lie already latent in the symbolism of these ancient records; in the narrative of the garden, where the LORD God vouchsafed to enter into conscious fellowship with man, and in the midst of which was the tree of life. By the power of this spiritual fellowship man felt himself to be completely differentiated from the lower animal creation, in which he could therefore find no appropriate counterpart. And thus upon the obvious general distinction of sex, was built up into the very structure of Humanity that unique psychical and spiritual relation between man and woman, which was to become a sacramental means to the more complete ethical and spiritual development of each.

Thus, all through the long dark centuries

until at length "the Light of the World" was Himself fully manifested, there was kept alive in the midst of Israel some dim realization of the coming glory—glimpses seen from afar of that unique dignity of man as destined to be knit to God through the Incarnate Person of the Lord, designed to become a very shrine of God because organically united into the mystical body of the Christ. So, when at length He Himself, the Eternal Word made flesh, fulfilled these ancient hopes, and in His Incarnation stamped forever upon human nature an ineffaceable witness to man's supernatural life, the message was felt to be the response to aspirations which had grown in strength and clearness through many generations, aspirations which, in many a dark day when appearances seemed so contrary, had been nurtured and fed by this first Gospel of hope. Turn over the pages of the Psalter, so unique in the literature of the world as an expression of the quickened spiritual aspirations of men. What are they but one continued and abiding witness to the power of this ancient message—to its revelation of that original fellowship with God in which men had again learned to recognise the true goal of the soul, the one fountain of its life and peace. And

not merely in the aspirations of the Psalter, but in the triumphant songs of the Christian Eucharist, the faithful throughout the ages do even now hand on this ancient message. The symbolic voices of Genesis are heard once more re-echoed in the Eucharistic song of the Christian Church, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts. Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory." There is the very message enshrined in the creation pictures of Gen. i. "Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High." There the realisation again in the boundless mercy of God, even here on earth, of the spiritual fellowship of the first Paradise of Gen. ii.

Thus, then, by this primitive Revelation of Nature, of Humanity, and of God, as they stand mutually related to one another in the eternal purpose of creation, men were and are being weaned not merely from that idolatry of the creature of which S. Chrysostom speaks (for if man could find in the lower creation no helpmeet for himself, how could he recognise in any of its parts a fitting likeness of God), but, also, from the degradation of his own nature, which ever follows close in the track of unlawful worship. The Christian Apostle, in the fulness of time when with a master's hand

he lays bare the inner secrets of the immoralities of heathendom, did but emphasise the warning of these twin Divine pictures. Those glowing sentences in which S. Paul shows, by appeal to the long sad vista of actual history, how a godless secularism must ever be the implacable foe of human purity, the inner fountain of its perpetual self-degradation, only restate in the full light of adequate experience of the Incarnation and Mission of the Spirit, the same teaching which lies already germinally contained in the story of Eden.

It would seem, then, that in proportion as historical and critical investigation is opening up new questions as to the derivation on their human side of one part or another of the sacred writings, God is thereby calling faithful souls to a deeper study of the inner spiritual connection which knits the whole Revelation together, to a fuller realisation of that living bond of a common inspiration issuing forth from one and the same Divine Spirit. There must always be in such critical investigations much which for the time being will remain more or less in suspense, and on which a provisional judgment is alone possible. A strain upon faith to a greater or less degree is thus in-

evitable. It is a trial from which we cannot escape. It can be met only by a deeper realisation of the spiritual unity of the whole Revelation. The necessary discipline through which we have to pass becomes thus in the loving Providence of God a means of revealing to us more clearly than before the exceeding greatness of the Divine treasure entrusted to our care.

Passing on now to the narrative that we are more especially to consider this morning, that of Gen. iii., we find there, I believe, a foreshadowing of the great principles involved in the mystery of Our Lord's Passion and Temptation exactly analogous to those symbolic glimpses we have already traced of the blessed facts of the Incarnation and of Pentecost.* That whole division of the Book of Genesis which begins with the third chapter and ends with the "generations of Terah" (this latter section introducing to us the great father of the faithful), embodies, as I venture to think, those fundamental conceptions concerning sin, its origin and results, its spreading power among men, and God's eternal attitude towards it, which are the necessary means of preparing us rightly to receive the message of the Passion. It seems

* See Lecture III.

hardly too much to say that this key to a right understanding of the inner meaning of our Blessed Lord's atoning work is assumed to be in our hands as a necessary interpreter of its central mystery ; just as it is constantly made use of in the teaching of the inspired Apostles. Whilst the neglect of the fundamental teaching of this narrative, when considering the mysteries of evil and of Redemption, has again and again led men into serious religious error.

Note then, first, the light here thrown upon the mystery of Temptation.

Evil, as we see, approaches man from without. It has no original place either in human nature or in the creation of which man is the divinely constituted representative and head. Here we have a clear authoritative condemnation of Dualism in all its forms ; an initial judgment upon a tendency which the sad experience of humanity and the present aspect of things have endowed with a terrible attractiveness in the eyes of men. The victory over pessimistic Dualism which was finally won by the message of the Incarnation, had already begun when these teachings of Genesis were entrusted to the care of God's ancient Church. But evil, though it does not originate

in the creation, yet uses the creation as a means through which to make its approach.

The right relation in which man stood to the created things around him was already clearly indicated. He was to move amongst the creation as Prophet, Priest, and King. As Prophet to represent God therein, as Priest to voice its unconscious service before God, as King to bring it into an ever deeper, more harmonious fellowship with himself, to defend it against the inroads of disorder and of moral evil. Clearly, it was in this relation to the creation that man's supreme responsibility and testing lay; and so it is in this special relation that the Tempter finds his ground of attack. Through the creation he obtains his channel of approach. S. Augustine finds in the speaking of the serpent a kind of demoniacal possession which he compares to the present voicing of the suggestions of the Tempter by evil men or by false prophets.* At any rate, we are clearly intended to see an effort from without, making itself felt through the medium of the

* De Genesi ad Litt. xi. 4. "Quid ergo mirum si suo instinctu diabolus jam implens serpentem, eique spiritum suum miscens, eo more quo vates dæmoniorum implere solet, sapientissimun eum reddiderat omnium bestiarum secundum animam vivam irrationalemque viventium?"

creation, to seduce man from his Divinely appointed guardianship. A striking analogue is it not of that supreme trial in the after-times in which the devices of the Evil One were found finally wanting, and he himself baffled and defeated in his triple attempt to withdraw our Lord from the gracious office He had come to fulfil as the Head and Redeemer of our race. For, as has been often pointed out, it is in the nature of the work our Lord had vouchsafed to accomplish for us, and in the voluntary humiliation and sufferings which that work involved, that the full stress of the Temptation recorded in the Gospel is to be found.

But to return. This original office of man towards the creation, as is clearly implied in the narrative of Genesis, reaches its highest point of concentration in his attitude towards the two special trees of the garden, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. S. Augustine, in speaking of the tree of life, says: "In cæteris lignis alimentum, in illo sacramentum."* The other trees served for bodily food. Here was the means of access to the sustenance of man's higher nature, the gracious sacramental food communicated through

* De Gen. ad Litt., viii. 8.

the earthly channel by which his life of advancing communion with God was ever to be mentioned and sustained—the type in surely no uncertain fashion of that consecrated food of the Eucharist through which we receive the spiritual gifts of our souls' sustenance, even the most Blessed Body and Blood of our Lord. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, as its name implies, has reference to man's mental and spiritual development, to that aspect of his character which was to proceed out of his higher spiritual life. The relation between the trees seems exactly paralleled by that between the "image" and the "likeness" mentioned in Gen. i. 26. In each case we have an internal development, resting back upon a Divine gift. This mental and spiritual progress of man, then, was conditioned, so we are told, by one essential law. The way by which he was to attain (through his life of communion with God and by the harmonious contemplation of the creation entrusted to his charge) to an ever-deepening consciousness alike of good and evil, was like unto the way in which God Himself knows these things. Not by eating of the tree, implying such a use of the creation as was foreign to his trust, a use

involving the actual experience of evil; but with the knowledge of perfect purity which attains to the conception of evil only as the hateful reverse of good. The knowledge which thus comes to realise evil by its very experience of a Divine life advances also of necessity in that unchanging hatred of it which is the essential character of God Himself. As S. Augustine said long ago, in reference to this matter, "Per prudentiam boni malum scitur, etsi non sentitur."* By the careful guarding of good, evil is known without being experienced. We may add, too, that only in this way can evil really be known. For to know evil we must know goodness. But, by an inevitable law, each experience of evil in ourselves blinds us to the realities of goodness, and so to the real nature of evil also. Thus we come to see how the prohibition which was the test of man's fidelity was also the necessary guardian of his progress. It preserved him in the only path in which true knowledge either of good or evil could be obtained. Call up to the mind some true, priestly soul, one of those which God has given in such gracious abundance to our own

* De Gen. ad Litt., viii. 32.

Communion in these latter years—one like Liddon or Pusey, marked out above all things by a holy indignation against sin, coupled with a searching knowledge of its subtle ramifications in the heart of man—so may you gain a real, though but imperfect conception of the depth and beauty of moral and spiritual discernment which lies enshrined in the guarding of man's right relation towards the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The symbolism itself of the trees probably rests back upon the Babylonian wisdom, just as we saw in the case of the narratives of the Creation. Amongst the broken fragments of the Assurbanipal tablets Mr. Boscawen has lately found a fragmentary reference to the sin of man in connection with an apparently forbidden tree, which by its external resemblance to the account in Genesis makes it very probable that the two rest back upon a common source. The translation of the Boscawen fragment given by Professor Sayce runs as follows :

"In sin one with another in compact joins.

"The command was established in the Garden of the God.

"The Asnan tree they ate they broke in two,

"Its stalk they destroyed,
"The sweet juice which injures the body,
"Great is their sin; themselves they exalted
"To Merodach their Redeemer, he (the God Sar) appointed their fate."*

In the broken state of this fragment we can unfortunately obtain no information either as to the circumstances which led to the sinful compact, the exact nature of the broken commandment, or the fate which followed on human transgression. It seems clear, however, that the injunction had regard to the physically harmful properties of the Asnan tree (said to be a kind of pine), the juice of which, as the tablet directly states, "injures the body." Here we notice exactly the same phenomenon as before—a remarkable parallelism in the setting of the cuneiform and the Biblical narratives, combined with the entire absence in the former of that moral and spiritual teaching which permeates every detail of the Biblical account.

But to continue. The assault of the Tempter is directed primarily upon the woman. The purity of woman around which, as we have noticed, a divine shield was thrown in the mysteri-

* The Babylonian and Oriental Record, iv., 11 (1890), quoted in Sayce, The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 104.

ous narrative of her formation, remains ever a special object of attack, whether by the Evil One or by evil men; whilst on the other hand, to protect and to shield the life of womanhood has been through the ages the one dominant aim of the Church of the Virgin-born: may I not say the passionate impulse of all who are renewed after the pattern of Jesus Christ.

The object of the Temptation in its three divisions is to break down in the woman that harmony of mind and purpose with the will of God which stood as the sure guardian of the portals of her soul, and which must be dispossessed before evil could find an entrance there. The Tempter strove with a force which grew with awful rapidity as the evil suggestion began to find any foothold in her heart, to snap the links of loving gratitude, of humble trust, and reverent awe, which bound Eve in perfect loyalty to the will of God. The parallelism between the successive stages of the temptation in the case of Eve and in that of our Blessed Lord is most striking. The devil's first aim is to implant in the woman's mind the suggestion of an arbitrary and unnecessary straitness in her appointed lot. "*Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every*

tree in the garden?" Next follows close upon its predecessor the suggestion of presumption, "*Ye shall not surely die.*" On the contrary, "*God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil.*" As soon as that seducing falsehood had gained admittance into the soul of Eve the sad work was done, the triumph of evil secured. The sacred links of loving allegiance which bound her in holy troth to the Creator were already snapped. Now she stood alone, her sweet mantle of grace fallen from off her, nay, already unheeded, lying beneath her feet. Nothing more was necessary to add force to the final temptation—desire of the fancied good. She can now be left to herself while the Evil One in triumph watches the steps of his victim. When the woman saw the beauty of the tree and pictured to herself its desirability as the source of knowledge before withheld, her fall was complete. "*She took of the fruit thereof, and did eat.*" May we not note here a warning much needed in our own day, weighted as it is with the awful emphasis of a world's transgression: that however much woman's sphere may admit of legitimate expansion in

suitable directions, yet it can never be identical with, but must always remain complementary to, that of man. So that to place woman in positions which require independent leadership and involve primary responsibility is both to subject her to the gravest peril as well as to deprive her of her own unique influence and power.

The effects of the victory of evil are quickly seen — even the divinely ordered fellowship between man and woman is now turned into a fulcrum for the second great temptation, and becomes the means which led to the second sin. "*She gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat.*" Thenceforth the die was cast. The poison had entered into humanity with all its terrible power, reversing each law which God had laid deep in human nature for good by fashioning therefrom a fresh source of misery and sin.

The sad sequel is traced out in the succeeding narratives. There we see laid bare for all time the multifarious fruits of evil as it inworks itself into the whole life of men. The familiar adage, "Corruptio optimi pessima," finds its fullest illustration in the pictures of the Book of Genesis. These pictures in which we be-

hold one good gift of God after another—the glorious bounties of Nature,* the strong ties of blood,† the blessed obligation of worship,‡ the advances of civilisation,§ the relation between the sexes,‖ the law of daily food,¶ the bonds of social and national life,** all in turn transformed beneath the touch of evil, ministering in differing ways to the spread of its terrible power. No one surely can read with any degree of spiritual discernment these narratives of the fall of Eve and of Adam, of the worship of Cain and its results, of the arrogance of Lamech rejoicing in the added powers which civilisation had given him, of the intercourse of the sons of God with the daughters of men, of the fall of Noah, or the building of the tower of Babel, and not recognise in the successive scenes a sad but faithful portraiture of the history of our humanity in its fallen state. The warning is needed in our own age of greatly vaunted but largely godless civilisation, at least as much as in any that has gone before; still in many varied forms "the Goddess of Humanity" claims the adoration of the sons of men. Can we afford to value

* Gen. iii. 6. † iii. 6, 12. ‡ iv. 5. § iv. 23, 24.
‖ vi. 2. ¶ ix. 21. ** xi. 4.

lightly this Divine and humbling revelation of the real loathsomeness which is hid there, concealed beneath the outward beauty of her flowing skirts? Can we, the Divinely commissioned guardians of human souls, ever allow those hallowed portraits by which from earliest childhood such vitally essential truths are brought home to the hearts of all, gentle or simple, learned or unlearned, to men of every differing degree of civilisation or enlightenment, to be in any degree weakened in their force through our neglect or failure to appreciate their true aim and power? Dare we take the awful responsibility of allowing their spiritual force to be blunted by any supposed inferences from the results of modern criticism? It cannot be. On the contrary, the Church of the twentieth century, I am bold to predict, will point her children with a quickened reverence, and yet deeper spiritual insight than that to which we have attained to these divine portraitures, as she traces in them the counterparts of the revelation given in the Passion and sufferings of the Christ. Like the blessed Apostle, she will find there foreshadowed the manifold workings in each age of that ancient woe, whereby *through the disobedience of the one*

the many were made sinners, that with deeper, truer gratitude she may appropriate the saving power of the *obedience* of that Blessed One, through whom the awful stream has been reversed, and *the many* shall be *made righteous*.

But to return to the narrative itself. Between the account of the Fall and the succession of portraits which illustrate the varied growth of evil proceeding therefrom, there is a pause. The great transgression must first be shown to us as it stands unmasked in the presence of God. The sophistries of Satan are seen at their true worth when brought to the bar of a Divine questioning. The enormity of human sin must be manifested in the light of the just sentence of God. In the judgment passed upon the serpent we can trace already the dim outlines of the Cross, as it stands uplifted against the dark background of evil. The necessary law of our Redemption, whether in our Lord's atoning work or in the sanctifying ministration of His Church, stands already clearly indicated, that only in one way—by the voluntary acceptance of suffering—can the awful power of sin be overcome.

It might surely have been supposed that this majestic passage, in which faithful souls have ever loved to see the inviolable purity and the all-searching judgment of God combined with the manifestations of His loving mercy; that this "Protevangel," as it has been so rightly called, would have been safe from the superficial disparagement of modern criticism. But it has not been so. President Harper, commenting upon this section of Genesis, tells us "that so far as concerns the attributes of God, the representation, however interpreted, is not so clear and distinct" * as in P, as to which document we are informed that any thought of Divine "jealousy, so common throughout antiquity, is entirely foreign." Whilst here, "when man has eaten the fruit and thus gained one superhuman attribute, viz., wisdom (iii. 7), there is danger that he will gain another such attribute, viz., immortality (iii. 22), and that this may not happen he is driven forth from Eden." † "Gained superhuman wisdom" indeed! Where, we may well ask, save in the lying sophistries of the Tempter, is there any vestige of such a con-

* Hebraica, Oct., 1888–July, 1889, vol. v., p. 30.
† Hebraica, Oct., 1888–July, 1889, vol. v., p. 31.

ception? Dr. Harper fortunately gives the reference, so that we may be in no uncertainty as to the authority on which he relies. We are referred to Gen. iii. 7, and there we are plainly told the real nature of the superhuman wisdom which they had gained. "*So the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were—naked*"!! So in the awful poverty of their new-born shame, "*they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.*" This, then, was the superhuman knowledge they had won, which criticism represents as exciting the jealousy of God. The bitter consciousness of their own shame, the knowledge which was itself the dark shadow of a hateful blindness, was settling down upon their whole being. The phrase in iii. 22, which Dr. Harper does not cite in this connection, "*Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil,*" when taken, as it should be, in the light of its context, is seen to refer not to a real advance in wisdom, but to the rending of merciful limitations, which shielded the development of man's knowledge; to the premature and illicit acquisition of the knowledge of evil by experience, which, like every species of unlawful knowledge, does not

really impart wisdom to the possessor, but rather destroys it. Surely we are entitled to protest against all this as not merely a grossly inaccurate but an utterly unjustifiable method of dealing with Holy Scripture. As soon might one expect to hear the sacred volume branded as atheistic on account of the well-known utterance of the fool in the Psalter, as to find the merciful Creator suspected of an unworthy jealousy of the shame of his poor fallen creatures. But Dr. Harper does not stand alone in this matter. His comparatively guarded statement is entirely thrown into the shade by Professor Addis in his recent volume entitled "the Documents of the Hexateuch." This writer bluntly puts the critical position as follows: "Man," he says, "had learnt wisdom by eating the forbidden fruit, and had become Yahweh's rival. Hence Yahweh was afraid that man having learnt to distinguish physical good from evil, would eat of the tree of life and so ward off death and decay for ever. Yahweh is far from omniscient, and he is also envious. The same idea of the Divine jealousy is prominent in Herodotus," etc.* It is hardly necessary

* Documents of the Hexateuch, pp. 6, 7.

to say how entirely destitute of any shadow of foundation the whole conception is. The immortality from which God's sentence of expulsion shielded man was, like the knowledge he had acquired, a loss and not a gain. It is clear from the sacred text that man had, prior to his fall, the right to eat of the tree of life as a sacramental means of sustaining that life of God within him, in which life lay the gift of a true immortality. But when, by his own act, the links which bound his soul in communion with God were severed, and the purity of his nature was defiled, the sacramental means became changed into a fresh source of his condemnation. To have approached it now in the condition in which man had fallen, with the law of spiritual death working in his members, might possibly (if we are right in so interpreting the text) have prolonged his bodily existence. But to have permitted this would have been not merely the infringement of a Divine sentence, it would have been a terrible aggravation of human misery—nothing less than to fasten upon him a life in the same relation to the immortality for which he was originally destined as the illusory knowledge he had acquired stood to that wisdom he was origi-

nally designed to gain. For as S. Athanasius so beautifully teaches in the "De Incarnatione Verbi," * physical death is but the first and most striking external sign of the inward process of dissolution which sin causes in the whole nature of man. The law of death slowly but surely works itself into the whole man, spirit and soul as well as body. The Divine sentence runs, "*For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" Not, Thou shalt be put to death, as of a finished act, but, "*Thou shalt surely die,*" as of a process of death which, though already begun, yet awaits its own ultimate manifestation in the spiritual and psychical as much as in the bodily sphere. The first death of the body is but the significant type of that "second death," which marks the final consummation of the developing results of evil; and neither the one nor the other is equivalent to a mere cessation of existence. Moreover, immortality in its true and highest sense must not be regarded simply as an original gift to humanity, but as the ultimate reward of man's rightful development, which was to be crowned at length by the predestined fellowship with the Eternal Word, who is Himself

* See Sections 5 and 6.

the Life. To refer once again to the teaching of S. Chrysostom. In his commentary on this passage he clearly indicates that the ejection from Paradise was rather the sign of God's care than merely of His wrath, lest man should sin perpetually.*

The same merciful judgment is shown in the other sentences also. In that of physical death, with its necessary humbling of human pride and limitation of the power of human wickedness, or in the separate sentences of labour and toil on man,† of subordination and travail-pain on woman,‡ in all of which may be clearly seen not merely the vindication of God's holiness by the due and appropriate punishment of each offence, but also (humanity having become what it has), we can recognise therein gracious barriers against the oncoming flood of evil, which else might have burst upon the race with resistless force.

But Mr. Addis goes further: Not only is Yahweh jealous, he is also "far from omni-

* "Ὥστε καὶ τὸ πλησίον καὶ ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου προστάξαι κατοικεῖν τὸν ἐκεῖθεν ἐκπεπτωκότα μεγίστης κηδεμονίας σημεῖον ἦν, ἵνα καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς θέας ὑπόμνησιν ἔχῃ, καὶ τοῦ ἐντεῦθεν κέρδους ἀπολάυῃ, καὶ μηδὲ ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς φιλοζωΐας ἔχων, καὶ ἔξω τυγχάνων, κατατολμήσῃ τῆς τοῦ ξύλου βρώσεως."—Homilia in Gen. xviii., 3, ed. Gaume, p. 182.

† Hom. XVIII., 3. ‡ Hom. XVIII., 4.

scient."* The reference is here clearly to the Divine questioning of Adam and Eve, by which the sinful pair were brought to acknowledge their guilt. What! has Mr. Addis never heard of a father questioning his child, even though he may have the fullest proof and knowledge of that child's wrongdoing? Surely it is far more true to experience to say with S. Chrysostom, in his magnificent seventeenth Homily on Genesis, perhaps one of the finest examples we possess of the eloquence and spiritual discernment of that great preacher of the Ancient Church; God in His merciful condescension "questions them not as one that was ignorant but being acquainted with all, that He might manifest His own love for men He condescends to their weakness and summons them to confession of their sins."† In this case at least, the opinion of the ancient Father seems far wiser and truer than the interpretation of the modern critic.

* Documents of the Hexateuch, p. 7.

† Homilia in Gen. xvii. 5 (Ed. Gaume, p. 166). The argument is elaborated in the first seven sections of the Homily. Cf. the following magnificent passage from section 3: "*μακρθομεῖ καὶ ἀνέχεται, καὶ ἐρωτᾷ, καὶ ἀπόκρισιν δέχεται, καὶ πάλιν ἐρωτᾷ μονονουχὶ εἰς ἀπολογίαν αὐτὸν ἐκκαλούμενος, ἵνα ἀφορμὴν λαβὼν, τὴν οἰκείαν φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ μετὰ τὴν τοσαύτην παράβασιν περὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιδείξηται.*"

Nor should we omit to notice the intimate and vital connection between the twofold sentence on our sin and the double aspect of human nature set before us in Gen. i. 26, which we have noted above; the "image" in which man was created corresponding to his unique endowments; the "likeness," on the other hand, to the character he was to attain by virtue of a Divine fellowship. Each portion of the original gift is visited by an appropriate sentence after the fall. In the sentence of death is involved the gradual weakening and ultimate deprivation of the endowments or "image;" whilst the loss of the Divine fellowship which lay at the back of the "likeness" is plainly symbolized in the mandate of expulsion from Eden.

Nor does it seem to have been a mere accidental resemblance that when the Blessed One as our representative tasted death for every man, and so voluntarily took to Himself that first penalty of our sin, He should also have condescended to stoop to our alienated position in His fellowship with us sinners, so that, enwrapped in the veil of thick darkness He uttered forth the bitter cry of isolation, *My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?*

To sum up, then, our detailed examination of Gen. iii. The first three chapters of Genesis have been seen to be bound to one another by vital and essential spiritual bonds, such as weld them together into an inseparable organic unity. On their literary side they appear to show strong marks of common derivation from a primal source, which itself underlies the Babylonian wisdom. The differences pointed out by critics may, so far as they have real existence at all, as reasonably be supposed to adhere in the original tradition (which in its later form has marked points of contact with all three chapters) as in a difference of authors. It seems difficult to understand how such differences can be incompatible with unity of authorship on the one hand, and yet be found consistent with the work of an intelligent redactor on the other. This much, however, at least may be said. If narratives so vitally bound together as Gen. i., on the one side, and Gen. ii. and iii. on the other, are really the work of different authors with an entirely separate literary history, it only serves to throw into yet greater prominence the marvel of their complete ethical and spiritual unity. Nor can we stop there. These narratives are not merely

thus united in themselves, they stand in equally close connection, as we have seen, with the sections which immediately succeed them. Their teachings are assumed in every page of the subsequent Old Testament Revelation. They underlie the whole substance of the Gospel. They form the fruitful basis of the most developed Christian theology, the needed monitor and guide for human action amid the perils of the nineteenth Christian century, just as much as in the circumstances of ancient Palestine. As we come to ponder these things the conclusion will, I believe, deepen within us into an irresistible, unalterable conviction, that whatever may be the secret of the literary history of these opening chapters of Genesis, they certainly bear upon their forefront the evident marks of the very finger of God.

And with this conviction we can patiently and hopefully bear the burden of any difficulties connected with these early sections which in the present state of our knowledge we are unable completely to solve, such as, for example, the questions raised by the genealogies in chap. v., and the numbers therein contained, which appear as insoluble upon the critical as upon the traditional methods. Or again, the true

interpretation of the narrative which stands at the opening of chap. vi. still remains an open question, although it is possible that fresh light may at any time be thrown upon it by further Babylonian discoveries. I am unable to examine in detail the alleged differences which have weighed with some advanced critics in dividing the Jahvistic narrative into at least three sources, so replacing it by J1, J2, J3.* The reasons alleged for such subdivision appear quite insufficient to bear the weight put upon them, and as they do not seem to have won any large measure of general acceptance, even in critical circles, it may suffice to give them this passing mention. As to the great table of the nations in chap. x., the cuneiform discoveries have in a multitude of cases dispelled the uncertainty which previously surrounded much of its contents, and have thus abundantly verified its historical value as an authentic chart of the ancient world. It seems probable that we do not yet possess sufficient data to go much further than this, or to determine at all accurately the date to which it belongs. Professor Sayce places its composition in the age of

* For the details of this analysis and the grounds upon which it is based see Budde, Die Biblische Urgeschichte.

Ezekiel. It gives, he says, "a geographical chart or picture of the Jewish world as it existed in the seventh century B.C."* The question has in any case no bearing upon the date of the rest of the book. Chap. x. is complete in itself. Its insertion may well have been the work of the Ezrahite Redactor, illustrating from the then condition of the world the division of men after the flood as recorded in chap. xi. If this be so, it will also explain an apparent anachronism in the fact that this table of separated nationalities precedes the narrative in Gen. xi., whilst it would seem at first sight more natural that it should follow it. On this point we may well be content to await the verdict of fuller knowledge.

The consideration of the narrative of the Deluge will form part of the next Lecture.

Meanwhile even though we should assume that the Church may never be able to completely pierce the secret of the human development of these Divine pictures, at least we may hold with sure conviction that they will ever abide with her as cherished fountains of *teaching*, of *reproof*, of *correction*, and *instruction in righteousness*. That she will see in them through

* The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 153.

all the Christian ages a permanent embodiment of the working of that prophetic spirit of which it stands recorded,"*The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.*"

V.

THE DELUGE AND THE PATRIARCHS.

LECTURE V.

THE DELUGE AND THE PATRIARCHS.

"*These all died in faith, not having received the promises but having seen and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.*—Hebrews xi. 13.

THE narrative of the Deluge seems intended to occupy a mediate position in the Book of Genesis.

On the one side it closes the series of pictures in which have been set before us, first, the essential principles of Creation, and then the sad story of the gradual inworking of evil into human nature and human society. On the other hand, it stands forth as a signal instance of God's merciful and gracious election, and so prepares us for that contraction of stand-point which marks the remaining sections of the Book, devoted as they are to the portraiture of the elect ancestors of a chosen people.

Thus, then, the Deluge occupies a mediate

position between that ancient world in its advancing guilt and darkness, unrelieved by any continuous Revelation of God, and the whole stupendous drama of God's electing grace; and this whether we consider it in the sphere of Judaism preparing the way for the Incarnation, or in the history of the Christian Church ushering in at the last the final Judgment of God. As the great act of Judgment on the ancient world it forms the necessary background of the whole series of God's wondrous revelations of grace, for it disclosed for all time the Eternal Judgment of God, His unchanging attitude towards human sin; and thus furnished an abiding setting, through which sinful men can rightly view the gracious purposes of Redemption. The Deluge, with its clear piercing note of Judgment upon sin, guards through all the ages the true significance of the Passion of the Christ. For it compels men to trace in the Cross the eternal revelation of the wrath of God against moral evil, the fullest manifestations of God's absolute righteousness, as well as the supreme appeal of His love. Thus the character of God is vindicated from all appearance of indifference to sin. The way is prepared for the Revelation of Himself in our suf-

fering flesh as men are thus taught to look on from that supreme manifestation of love to the great Judgment, to the disclosure of God's final and absolute verdict upon human action, when the true measure of each shall be fully shown, as it has all the time been clear and open in the sight of God. Hence the signal and unique Judgment of men recorded in Genesis has an abiding moral and spiritual significance, a lesson of essential import to all generations. We must assign to it the same absolute position in the "Prologue" to the subsequent Revelation as the narratives of the Creation and the Fall.

Passing now from the deeper significance of the narrative to its external form, a similar relationship to that previously noticed exists between the inspired accounts and the cuneiform tablets of Babylonia. Again, unfortunately, the Assurbanipal tablets are in some respects incomplete, although in a far less degree than in the case of the "Creation" tablets. We have adequate evidence that the Babylonian account existed in differing forms, and this witness of the cuneiform tablets is corroborated by the later testimony of Berossus, preserved in Greek literature. A comparison of the Scriptural and

Babylonian records of the Deluge conducts us to conclusions exactly agreeing with those deduced in the previous instances. Not only are polytheistic and mythological elements prominent in the one case and replaced by a purer monotheistic conception in the other; but, as we have already seen, the historical facts are in the Sacred Records regarded in a new light, and so become the channel of permanent ethical and spiritual truth.

As specimens of portions of the cuneiform story which are lacking in the Biblical account we may note the account of the sorrow and indignation caused amongst the gods by the coming of the flood.

"In the heaven,

"The gods feared the deluge, and hastened to ascend to the heaven of Anu.

"The gods cowered like a dog lying in a kennel.

"Istar cried like a woman in travail.

"The great goddess spake with a loud voice.

. . . . . .

"The gods wept with her because of the spirits of the underworld.

"The gods sat dejected in weeping, their lips were covered." *

*Sayce: The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 111.

Or once again the companion picture of the wrath and fierce anger of the great goddess Ishtar at the rash act of Bel in causing such a calamity.

"The great goddess lifted up the mighty bow which Anu had made according to his wish.

"These gods, by my necklace never will I forget.

"Those days, I will think of them and never will forget them.

"May the gods come to my altar (but) let not Bel come to my altar, since he did not take counsel but caused a flood and counted my men for judgment." *

Other features of interest are the allusion to the questionings of the people as to the reason for building the ark; the mention of the thick darkness which enwrapped the earth at the time of the Deluge itself; and the closing scene in which Bel blesses Sisosthros and his wife, and grants them to become as the gods. It may be noted also that Sisosthros, who seems to hold a kingly position, brings into the ship he had built besides the living creatures and his family, all his slaves and handmaids as well as the sons of his people. As to the reason of the flood no consistent account is

* Sayce: The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 112.

given. The writer appears to hover between the wickedness of men, the secret design of the gods, and the impulsive perversity of Bel. Possibly we have here reminiscences of separate versions of the story which were then subsequently combined. The account itself is of extreme antiquity, although recopied by order of the great King Assurbanipal. Professor Sayce places its probable composition about B.C. 2350, and describes it as already ancient in the days of the Patriarchs.*

If now we turn to the critical analysis of the Biblical account and examine the so-called Elohistic and Jahvistic sections in the light of the cuneiform records, our results quite corroborate the similar conclusions drawn in regard to the pictures of Creation and Paradise. Even more obviously than before each account, Elohistic and Jahvistic, is seen to have independent marks of common ancestry with the Babylonian Epic.

Thus as points of importance common to the Elohist and the cuneiform writer we note the following: The pitching of the ark with pitch, the detailed specification of its dimensions and construction; the specified duration

* Sayce: The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 113.

of the stormy flood of waters (in the cuneiform records six days, in P one hundred and fifty); the grounding of the ark in the mountains; the looking forth in each case after the flood had ceased, and the mention of the bow in connection with the averting of any similar catastrophe.

The special points of agreement of the Jahvist with the cuneiform writer are as follows: The closing of the door of the ship after the entrance of Noah; the narrative about the sending forth of the three birds with the return of all but the third; the offering of the sacrifice after the flood and its acceptance; the assurance which is implied in the cuneiform inscription, but directly given in the Biblical narrative, that a judgment so sweeping and universal should not again be visited upon mankind.

Even the bare enumeration of these points of coincidence will suffice to show how evenly they are distributed between the two accounts. These phenomena place the conclusion beyond doubt that each narrative stands in a similar relationship to the Babylonian tradition. Thus, for example, it is impossible to suppose that the Jahvist used material derived from

ancient sources and of "Palestinian origin," whilst the Priestly account "was copied or rather paraphrased from the cuneiform tablets in the age of the Babylonian exile." * Independent historical reasons have already been given which make it in the highest degree improbable that such an hypothesis would in any case correctly explain the connection between the two sets of documents.† All the historical evidence points to the conclusion that the original of the various recensions of this great epic of Assurbanipal was in circulation prior to the age of the Patriarchs, and may therefore, with the highest degree of probability, be assumed to have been known to the Patriarchs or their descendants during the period of their prosperity in Egypt under Semitic rule, and with hardly less probability to Moses also. The points of similarity already noticed are very striking. Professor Sayce indicates three points, viz., the shutting the door of the ark, the sending forth of the birds, and the sacrifice of Noah, in which he thinks that the polytheistic original was corrected by the inspired Jahvist writer. This conclusion in

* See Sayce: The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 116.

† See Lecture III., pp. 110, 111.

the limited state of our knowledge as to the exact point at which the two streams diverge can, however, hardly be pressed. But the evidence does at least clearly point to a contact of the Jahvistic and Elohistic accounts with the Babylonian tradition under conditions of no great divergence in the two cases, whilst from historical and other grounds we may with a high degree of probability place the time of such contact in the Mosaic or pre-Mosaic period.

Certain points in the Biblical account are held by Professor Sayce to point strongly to a non-Babylonian source, and, as he thinks, to a Palestinian origin.* It seems open to question, however, whether the points selected would not be equally well explained by the Egyptian environment of the author. The substitution of an "ark" for a "ship" is at least as likely to be Egyptian as Palestinian, especially as the word used for the ark has marked affinities with the language of ancient Egypt. The nature of the gopher-tree is not certainly known. If it be correctly identified with the cypress, this wood, although not indigenous in the valley of the Nile, is yet in use

* The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 117.

in Egypt,* whilst the olive is common in Egypt as well as in Palestine.† The argument from the month in which the flood is stated to have begun seems somewhat too precarious to bear any great weight. There appears, therefore, as much to be said in favour of the hypothesis of Mosaic authorship as for that of a later composition in Palestine, *e.g.*, in the Solomonic age.

No presumption arises against a Mosaic authorship from the non-occurrence of the history of the Flood in Egyptian literature, for it is a commonplace that the undoubted Mosaic literature and institutions have no analogy with Egyptian religious thought or systems. The fact that Egyptian literature stands practically alone amongst the records of ancient peoples as the one literature in which no memory of the Deluge has been preserved is explained by the obvious consideration that in Egypt alone, the flooding of the country is a benefit rather than a misfortune; whilst an Egyptian narrative has actually been found describing

* "The weeping willow, myrtle, elm, and cypress are found in the gardens and plantations."—Article "Egypt," in Encycl. Brit., by R. S. Poole.

† "The fruit, seeds, or leaves of the . . . olive have been found in the tombs of Thebes."—Wilkinson: Ancient Egypt (abridged ed., Murray), vol. ii., p. 36.

the slaughter of men as an act of Divine judgment, which seems to point to an Egyptianized recension of the Babylonian Epic.* The well-known wide diffusion of the tradition of the Flood, even though it becomes necessarily localized in the hands of the separate peoples, points strongly to the original unity of men and to the historical reality of the event itself. Such traditions are found not merely amongst the Semitic peoples but in India, China, Greece, Persia, and amongst a number of different savage races originally inhabiting our American continent. Thus from many converging lines of evidence we may deduce a very strong probability that the inspired Biblical account rests back on a common historical tradition which was in the possession of the Israelites at least as early as the Mosaic period.

This conclusion is not necessarily at variance with the hypothesis that two separate versions of the Deluge are combined in our present narrative. It is of course possible that each may represent a form assumed in later times by the original Mosaic account. It must be borne in mind, however, that the comparison already

* Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology, t. iv., pp. 1–19, cited in Lenormont, Les Origines de l'Histoire, p. 448.

made with the cuneiform records certainly does not strengthen this possibility. We must therefore consider the arguments for such division on their own merits, remembering that, to say the very least, they derive no support from external sources.

It may be premised at the outset that the analysis would present much less difficulty under the assumption which until quite recently was universally made (that P represented the original account and J the later supplemental one), than when the reverse is taken to be the case. It must be borne in mind that the analytical division itself was made when the former and more natural hypothesis was everywhere accepted; and that it has since been engrafted bodily on the newer and precisely opposite view. Thus, the Jahvistic narrative contains no mention of the command to build an ark, or of the nature of its construction. It commences with the bare statement, "*And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark.*" Clearly this could not have been the original commencement of J's account. We must therefore conclude that the Redactor here rejected the original Jahvistic narrative in favour of the Elohistic docu-

ment. As the Jahvist is uniformly picturesque and flowing, and his narrative consequently attractive, it is hard to see why this sweeping rejection should have taken place. Or again, why, if the Elohistic account had preserved additional details (though it seems to have none which are not paralleled in the cuneiform tradition) they should not have been introduced into the existing narrative of J. The account as it now stands in Genesis is predominantly that of the Elohist, with the insertion of three main Jahvistic fragments — the supplemental injunctions given to Noah when about to enter the ark, the narrative about sending forth the birds, and that in regard to Noah's sacrifice and its acceptance. We are thus forced to conclude that if the analysis has any foundation at all, the main portion of the Jahvistic narrative was rejected, although, in the nature of the case, it must have covered practically the same ground as the Elohistic document. This supposition seems most improbable, and is moreover directly contrary to the usage of the Redactor elsewhere in Genesis. In the other sections where the two documents are combined we find exactly the reverse phenomenon, that only fragments from the Priestly

writer are embedded in the narrative of J and E.

Passing now from these general considerations to examine the specific grounds on which the critical division rests, the two main points adduced are the alleged duplication of the narrative of the entrance into the ark, and of the account of the actual Deluge itself. As to the first of these, the duplication is purely imaginary. We have quite naturally a command to build the ark for the reception of Noah and the living creatures, followed, after the long interval of time needed for its construction, by the definite injunction to enter into the ark now built. With this later command is given a specific indication of seven days as the interval yet to elapse before the final catastrophe, and precise directions as to the distinction to be observed between clean and unclean animals. What could be more natural than this? The somewhat disconnected reduplications in the actual narrative of the Deluge itself are easily explicable from the desire of the narrator to throw into strong emphasis the central catastrophe.

A serious objection arises to the critical division from the radical divergence it has

produced between the two documents as to the duration of the Flood. The analysis arbitrarily requires the forty days of chapter viii. 6, between the first subsidence of the waters and the sending forth of the birds, to be made identical with the forty days of chapter vii. 12, during which *the rain was upon the earth;* so causing a complete antagonism between the duration assigned to the Flood in the Jahvist and Elohistic accounts respectively. If, then, as is assumed in the assigned dates of the two documents, the Jahvistic account had been current for centuries, and the Flood had thus been long known to have lasted some sixty days, it is hard indeed to see what should have induced a Priestly writer to set himself in flagrant opposition to this accepted chronology, and to claim for the Deluge a duration of a whole year. Even the fruitful assumption of unconscious idealisation of history so frequently made in reference to the Priestly writer seems to fail us entirely here in furnishing a solution of the puzzle. The Elohist could not have been influenced by the cuneiform tablets, for these assign to the Flood a total duration of only fourteen days. But even if this point be conceded as in some way explica-

ble, it seems still more extraordinary that when the later narrative had in its turn won for itself acceptance, a Redactor should go out of his way to insert in a consistent and acknowledged account the absolutely contradictory figures of the now discredited Jahvist writer. Here is a plain case of direct contradiction between the two accounts. We are asked to believe that a Redactor, presumably inspired, harmonised these contradictory sets of figures in the subtle and misleading way in which they now stand connected in the Genesis narrative, instead of selecting either the one chronological system or the other. The contradiction is so glaring that it cannot have escaped notice. Such an estimate of the Redactor seems inconsistent with his possession of either common sense or common honesty. In truth, the analytical hypothesis bristles with insuperable difficulties as soon as we attempt to realise to ourselves the process by which the assumed narratives reached their present form. It is a comparatively easy thing to take the narrative as it stands and to explain in any particular case the supposed duplication, but to proceed from this point to accept the results which flow from the assumed division, whilst endeavouring to recon-

cile them with the sacred character of the narrative or with the great ethical and spiritual truths with which it is undoubtedly charged, forms a task of the most arduous and difficult character.

Further, it can hardly be questioned that in the critical examination of this narrative far too little weight has been given to its theological, as distinct from its purely historical side. The main object of the inspired writer was not accomplished by merely imparting to his readers correct historical information as to the doings of Noah or the natural phenomena of the Deluge. The inspired history of Noah is not one in which God is, as it were, thrown in to form a dark mysterious background to the earthly story. On the contrary, in the mind of the writer historical detail is throughout subordinate to his central aim, to reveal the character of God and the immutable principles which underlie His dealings with sinful men. From the point of view of a Rationalist like Eichorn or De Wette, it may appear an incomprehensible reduplication that God should first have given specific direction to his servant Noah as to the building of the ark, indicating in general terms the object it was to serve, in order to

supply a reasonable ground of faithful obedience to so startling and toilsome an injunction; and that long years afterwards, when at last his toil was over, he should have received a further Divine Revelation telling him to take the next step in the venture of faith, to entrust himself and his dearest to this novel structure, to utilise the short interval that still remained ere the flood came, in the detailed arrangements necessary to carry out the Divine intention. Surely from no fair standpoint can this be really classed as mere iteration. Again, the duplication of the picture of the wickedness of the antediluvian world seems perfectly natural when we remember that in chapter vi. 9, with the Elohistic narrative we are beginning a new section of the book. The results of the preceding section are summarised at the beginning of the new one, just as in precisely the same way we find a double mention of the three sons of Noah. What can be more insecure than a theory that postulates two separate documents because of the doubled statement as to the wickedness of the world, and yet itself assigns to one and the same document the equally doubled statement concerning the three sons of Noah. Clearly both duplications are

perfectly natural and neither needs any explanation at all. The two cases are exactly analogous, and if it has never been thought necessary to assume separate sources in the second case, why is it essential in the first?

To take another point. The distribution of the Divine Names in this section, the primal ground of the analysis, is entirely appropriate to the subject-matter in each case, and flows naturally therefrom. Where the relationship of God to all mankind is the predominating conception we find the name Elohim employed. Again, when the special relationship of grace in which God stood to Noah is prominent, there, just as we might expect, the Covenant name Jahveh is found. Thus take the successive Jahvistic sections; the command to enter the ark, the gracious act of protection implied in the Lord's shutting Noah in, the acceptance of his sacrifice and the recorded Divine purpose that such a Judgment should not again be visited upon the earth. Here clearly in each case Noah is contemplated as the object of God's electing grace; as the link on which hang the saving purposes of redemption. In the Elohistic sections the outlook is wider. The opening words, "*And God looked upon*

the earth; and it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them, and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth," * plainly indicate a verdict given to Noah upon human society in general as it existed before the Flood. Or again, the Elohistic section in chapter ix. contemplates Noah not now as the ancestor of the elect people but as the progenitor of a new world, gathering up into himself all future generations of men. This is indicated quite distinctly in the opening charge, "*Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth.*" Whilst a little later the all-embracing rainbow is made the sign set in the heavens of "*an everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh.*" The standpoint of this concluding section is unmistakably clear. It is the standpoint which naturally suggests the name of God which is used.

To sum up, then. With sincere deference to the great authorities who are ranged on the other side there seem valid grounds for claiming that whether or not, as Professor Sayce says,

* Gen. vi. 12, 13.

"the literary analysis which has given us a Jehovist and an Elohist and a Priestly Code must be supplemented or replaced by an analysis of the Book of Genesis into Babylonian, Canaanite, and other similar elements;"* at least it is necessary that that analysis itself should be throughout re-examined, both from the literary standpoint and also from the theological position of Catholic Christendom. At present it can hardly escape the judgment which so disinterested a critic as Mr. Matthew Arnold passes upon the rationalistic conception of Scripture generally; that "it makes far more difficulties than it solves," and again, "it rests on too narrow a conception of the history of the human mind."† We may add on "too narrow a conception" of the spiritual greatness and unique aim of the Holy Scriptures. Meanwhile the conclusion seems amply justified that the basis upon which the whole analytical division rests is much too precarious to admit of our building upon it any important conclusions whatever.

As we pass now to the Patriarchal history, these questions of literary analysis occupy a

* The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 171.

† Literature and Dogma, p. 149.

position of comparatively minor importance. With the exception of some genealogical tables and two or three narratives like those concerning the institution of circumcision or the death of Sarah, only fragmentary scraps here and there are assigned to the Priestly writer. The great mass of the narrative is fairly divided between the Jahvist and the second Elohist. As these writers are assumed to have been nearly contemporaneous, writing, the one in the Northern Kingdom and the other in the Southern, about the ninth century B.C., the division is, except on purely literary grounds, comparatively unimportant. The striking parallelism between the two narratives may fairly be held to imply a common original, which may or may not be identical with one of them, but the date of which must be prior to the division of the monarchy and the consequent separation of the kingdoms. Schultz, for example, places J in the Solomonic period. The dates usually assigned to these closely interrelated documents are conditioned by the fact admitted on all hands, that the narrative as we have it was well known to the great Prophets of the eighth century. Beyond this the evidence for the dates assigned is almost

entirely subjective—whilst if J and E (as seems probable if the division itself be assumed) rest back on a common original, we are absolutely without any means of determining the date of that original, Mosaic or otherwise.

We shall then omit any further discussion in regard to J and E, and proceed to consider a far more essential matter which claims our attention. I refer to the question as to the alleged unhistorical character of the whole Patriarchal history raised by the extreme critical school, and in particular by Kuenen and Wellhausen.

According to Kuenen "the narratives in Genesis present us, not with historical personages, but with personifications" * of Israel itself and of the nations round about. "They teach us what the Israelites thought as to their affinities with the tribes round about them, and as to the names of their own settlements in the land of their abode." † So, too, Wellhausen to similar effect: "In the patriarchal legend the ethnographic element is always predominant." ‡ "The legend itself for the most part is the product of a countless number of nar-

* Kuenen: Religion of Israel, Engl. ed., p. 111.
† Ibid., p. 113. ‡ Prolegomena, p. 320.

ratives unconsciously modifying each other's work." * With regard to Abraham, it is true, Wellhausen acknowledges some difficulty in satisfactorily explaining his existence on ethnographical principles. Not bearing "the name of a people like Isaac and Lot, he is somewhat difficult to interpret." † We must not, however, any the more on this account consider him "as a historical person" ‡—he might with more likelihood be regarded as "a pure creation of unconscious art." § So, too, the story of Joseph is in considerable part the "free work of poetry." Truly this is a clever way of getting rid of an unpleasantly insoluble difficulty — thus to sublimate the whole of the facts into the mysterious cloud-land of unconscious and therefore unknown art. A better illustration could hardly be found of what has been well described as the omnipotence of a German professor's ink. Even a reverent critic like Schultz, who acknowledges that we cannot in point of fact picture to ourselves the rise of the Hebrew religion in any other way than the Biblical account does,‖ when it repre-

* Prolegomena, p. 327. † Ibid., p. 320.
‡ Ibid. § Ibid., p. 320.
‖ Schultz : Old Testament Theology, p. 110.

sents Abraham as called out of the country of his birth into an unknown land, as entering into a covenant of circumcision with the God of his fathers, who appears to him, as bearing trial upon trial, receiving revelation upon revelation, promise upon promise, until he passed away honoured of God and man, whilst thus acknowledging that the facts connected with the Hebrew religion require exactly such a series of events as we find recorded in the history of Abraham, yet contends that we must "leave it undetermined in the present state of tradition how far the name of Abraham and the general sketch of his life are to be considered historical." *

As soon, then, as we have overcome our first natural repugnance to regarding these inimitable pictures which have won the admiration of unnumbered generations as the singularly happy outcome of a countless number of fragmentary attempts at political idealisation, we naturally ask on what grounds we are to accept so startling and unlovely an hypothesis. We may conveniently group the reasons given under three heads :

1. Considerations based on the difficulty of

* Schultz : Old Testament Theology, p. 95.

transmitting historical accounts of the Patriarchal period to the date assigned for the composition of J and E.

2. Reasons growing out of the character of the patriarchal narratives themselves; and, lastly,

3. The confirmation which this hypothesis affords to the similar assumption made as to the Priest's Code, and in particular to the non-existence of the law of the one sanctuary prior to the days of Josiah or thereabouts.

Let us briefly notice each of these points.

With regard to the difficulties of transmission the recent discoveries at Tell-el-Amarna have completely destroyed whatever force they were supposed to possess. We now know that there was no more difficulty in transmitting the records of the time of Abraham to Moses than in the similar transmission of the "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and Judah" in the days of the Israelitish monarchy. The primal ground of the hypothesis having fallen through, owing to our better knowledge of the circumstances of the Patriarchal period, the subjective considerations next to be considered are correspondingly weakened in force. Stand-

ing as they now do severely isolated, their weakness is much more easily seen.

We have already noted how completely the ethnographical hypothesis breaks down when applied to the history of Abraham—a large and fundamentally important part, surely, of the whole narrative. Moreover, it fails just as signally, as Wellhausen practically confesses, when applied to the case of Joseph.* As Mr. Watson, who has so carefully investigated this question in his capital book, "The Book of Genesis: a True History," well says,

"If Judah and Joseph were to change places in the patriarchal narrative, we might get a remarkable anticipation of the history of later times. There was a tribe which surpassed its fellows in moral and religious qualities. There was a tribe which like Joseph was separated from its brethren, and, standing alone, was the more faithful representative of the Kingdom of God. That tribe was Judah, not Joseph. Although that tribe had abun-

* "Joseph here (in the blessing of Jacob) appears always as the pillar of the North-Israelite monarchy. . . . The story of Joseph, however, in so far as historical elements can be traced in it all, and not merely the free work of poetry, is based on much earlier events, from a time when the union was first being accomplished of the two sections which together became the people of Israel. The trait of his brothers' jealousy of him points perhaps to later events."—(Prolegomena, p. 323.) This vague oscillation, with the appeal to "the free work of poetry" as an ultimate refuge, surely amounts to the surrender of the ethnographic theory.

dant opportunity, had it so willed, of manipulating the national tradition to its own honour and glory, yet we find in the facts of Genesis the very negative of any such purpose. It is the progenitor of the rival and faithless Kingdom of Ephraim who stands forth as the chaste and faithful deliverer of his brethren. The record of Judah, on the other hand, is stained by undisguised impurity and evil."*

A similar difficulty occurs, only in a more acute form, when we try to picture the history of Levi as the idealisation thrown back into the Patriarchal period of the history and character of that priestly tribe. A certain resemblance at first sight and in broad outline there undoubtedly is (as might indeed be expected) between the careers of Jacob and Esau and those of the nations which they represent. A moment's reflection, however, will show how impossible it is to conceive of an Israelite, in the days of the monarchy illustrating the relations of his people to the Edomites, whom they were again and again subduing, by the cringing artifices to which Jacob had to resort in order to pacify the wrath of Esau. It seems unnecessary to pursue the inquiry into further detail. The hypothesis of

* Watson : The Book of Genesis : a True History, p. 201.

political personification helplessly breaks down, and our first indignant revulsion from the vandalism which it involves is fully justified by the results of minute examination.

In truth this whole method of accounting for ancient narratives is already out of date. Discoveries like those of Schliemann at Troy and the other verifications of ancient records which have crowded upon us within the last two decades have completely altered the accepted views as to the formation of early traditions. A distinguished English archæologist has lately summed up the changed conclusions on this matter in these unmistakable terms: "The more we look into fairly early legends, the more disinclined we become to say that there is nothing substantial in them." * Archæological discovery has returned an unqualified negative to the wholesale assumption of mythical idealisation as forming the real basis of ancient narratives like those we are now considering.

But we are not left to rest our answer merely upon the *general* tendency of archæological science, strong and definite though it be. The

* Canon G. F. Browne, late Disney Professor of Archæology at Cambridge, in a lecture on English Church History, at St. Paul's Cathedral, since published.

recent discoveries in Biblical archæology have largely aided in forming this general tendency, and they affect in the most direct and obvious manner the historical character of the patriarchal narrative. A history like that of Gen. xiv. presented us with a picture of the political condition of the Asiatic kingdoms in the days of Abraham, which was until recently regarded as entirely unsupported by any other source. It was easy under these circumstances to assume that we had there only a free poetic creation of unconscious art, or the conscious invention of a later age. Such in point of fact was the verdict expressly passed upon it by critics like Nöldeke or Reuss, the real fathers of the Wellhausen school, and implied in the positions of Kuenen and Wellhausen, already noted. Recent discovery, however, has confirmed the whole historical setting of the narrative in such unqualified manner that it is now universally recognised to be a lifelike portraiture of the then political condition of the nations of Western Asia. The same stern logic of discovered fact has summoned back the person of Melchizedek the Priest-King of Salem, from the region of mythical fancy to which criticism had relegated him, into the

clear light of historical reality. We now know that at the date of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, Jerusalem was already an important city governed by a Priest-King, who, although subject to the Egyptian power, is expressly stated to hold a unique position of singular interest. He derived his appointment neither from the will of the Pharaoh, nor by hereditary descent from his father or his mother, but by the will of the great King, *i.e.*, the God to whom the inhabitants of the city offered supreme worship.* There can hardly be a doubt that in this peculiar political constitution of Jerusalem, of which no trace remains in the subsequent literature, we have the original of that magnificent figure, "the setting sun," † as he has been well called, of the primitive revelation, to whom Abraham did such signal homage. Equally conclusive is the testimony of Egyptian archæology to the fidelity of the picture drawn in the later chapters of Genesis. Semitic influence, as we now know, was dominant in Lower Egypt in the time of the Patriarchs. The general fidelity of the

* See this given in much greater detail in Sayce's The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 174f.

† Delitzch : New Commentary on Genesis I., p. 412.

Biblical narrative in its incidental references to Egypt has long been recognised. Yet it is interesting to note how each fresh discovery throws light upon points previously not fully understood. Thus, for example, the salutation with which the investiture of Joseph was greeted by the Egyptian people has occasioned much trouble to commentators. The word "Abrek" had no known Egyptian derivation, while "it was puzzlingly Semitic in its look." The Semitic character of the court of Lower Egypt, as now discovered, removes the difficulty, and we have been enabled to identify the word with a Babylonian title signifying "Seer." * The whole passage is thus made luminously clear. We can picture to ourselves that scene of long ago when the courtiers of the Pharaoh saluted the great "Seer" who had received this magnificent reward for his services in the interpretation of the royal dreams. What has been already done is, as Professor Sayce rightly says, "only an earnest of what will be achieved hereafter when the buried cities and tombs of the East have all been made to deliver up their dead." † Meanwhile

* See Sayce's The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 214.

† The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 233.

we may unhesitatingly affirm that the fidelity of the Book of Genesis to the contemporaneous local colouring and to the actual history of the times and countries described has been already made good, and this is equally the case whether we consider the Canaanitish or the Egyptian parts of the narrative.

It is quite obvious from the recent article of Professor Driver in reply to Professor Sayce's new book, published in the *Contemporary Review*, that this point is fully conceded.* Canon Driver, so far from disputing the general position taken up by Professor Sayce as to the fidelity in this respect of the narratives in Genesis, is at great pains to show that conservative critics like Ewald and Ebers have previously asserted the same. He is very anxious to clearly distinguish himself and critics in general from those whom he calls "certain extreme critics who accompany their literary criticisms of the Old Testament by a far-reaching and excessive historical criticism." Just below (the words are Canon Driver's) he complains that Professor Sayce's habit of never particularising names, and using always

* See Article on "Archæology and the Old Testament" in Contemporary Review for March, 1894, p. 416.

general terms, creates the impression in the reader's mind that critics generally are included in the same condemnation. In view of the wide-spread distress which has been caused to thousands of devout souls by the well known views of Wellhausen in this regard, it might perhaps have been well if Professor Driver, in thus separating himself from these extreme critics, had himself particularised names, and had expressed a well-deserved condemnation of the Wellhausen theory as to the unhistorical character of even the setting of the Patriarchal history. We may take it, therefore, that the position of Wellhausen and Kuenen as to that history can no longer be maintained, and may be assigned to the limbo of so many other forgotten theories. The confession of Hommel, one of Wellhausen's own followers, is practically conclusive as a full surrender of the "free creation" hypothesis. He says distinctly, "The Exodus of Abraham from Babylonia, the battle of the Canaanites with the Babylono-Elamite league in the valley of Siddim, and the journey of Abraham to Egypt are historic facts." *

* Cited in Scrader's Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Old Testament, Introductory Preface to English ed., p. xxi.

But Professor Driver, whilst conceding the historical colouring of the Pentateuch complains that it is deficient in local details. The distinction is perhaps somewhat subtle, but it is obviously made in the interests of his own critical position, viz., that the documents J and E were reduced to writing at a late period in the days of the monarchy, and hence although they rest upon a sound historical basis the writers had no information beyond that contained in their source. They were thus unable to add the little details which flow so naturally from the pen of a contemporary. In support of this view the only instance adduced is the fact that the individual personal names of the Pharaohs who appear in Genesis and Exodus are not given. From this Professor Driver infers that the author of the narrative was ignorant who these Pharaohs really were, which he could not have been had he been a contemporary.* The whole argument turns upon the assumption that if the author of the Book of Genesis had known who the Pharaoh was he would unquestionably have mentioned his name, as is done for instance by Jeremiah in speaking of Pharaoh Necho. I venture with

* Contemporary Review for March, 1894, p. 418.

some confidence to think that we have here a distinctly unsound assumption. Not merely, as Professor Sayce points out, is the usage of the Egyptian records themselves, in speaking of contemporaneous foreign kings, in exact agreement with that of Genesis,* but the Bible itself disproves the whole argument. Was Rabshakeh, for example, ignorant of the personal name of the master whom he served that in addressing the people on the wall of Jerusalem he never once breathes his name, but speaks only of "*the great king, the king of Assyria.*"† Or was Isaiah, the confidant of kings, ignorant of the name of the Pharaoh of his days, that he again and again lifts his warning voice against "*the counsellors of Pharaoh,*"‡ the trust "*in the strength of Pharaoh,*" § and so on, without specifying the name of the then reigning monarch. It surely needs no argument to show that the real heroes of the

* The Higher Criticism and the Monuments. "The individual name of a king is of little use to a stranger, however important it may be to those who draw up legal documents at home." P. 229.

† 2 Kings xviii. 19, 23, 28. Cf. also the reference to "Pharaoh, king of Egypt," in ver. 21. The parallel passage in Isaiah agrees with that in 2 Kings. The synopsis in the Chronicles clearly does not preserve the original form.

‡ Isaiah xix. 11 f.

§ Isaiah xxx. 2 ff.

Biblical narrative are not the rulers of Egypt but the Patriarchs of Israel, and that the personality of the Pharaoh is not further described simply because it had no bearing upon the object in hand. We might as well object to the Gospel of St. John because he nowhere specifies the name of the then reigning Cæsar to whom he refers.*

Few words are necessary to indicate the bearing of all this upon the question of the non-existence of the one sanctuary in the days of the composition of J and E. The theory by which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are made to worship at various places in order to throw additional sanctity round these different shrines in the days of the later monarchy is clearly a part of the general mythical hypothesis. It may be regarded, therefore, as being now as thoroughly discredited as it has all along been repulsive to any devout mind. The critical hypothesis as to the law of the one sanctuary gains no support from the Book of Genesis. If it is to be maintained at all it must be on the ground of considerations which claim an entirely different origin, and so lie outside the sphere of these Lectures. One thing at least, gentlemen, I trust

* St. John xix. 12.

I have succeeded in placing beyond all doubt, viz., that in studying the rich lessons of spiritual development which are found so abundantly in the history of the patriarchs, we are not giving heed to *cunningly devised fables*, but are in very truth standing at the fountain-head of that mighty stream whose waters ever issue forth from the Sanctuary of God—that we are sitting at the feet of those who in actual deed were the leaders amongst the heroes of faith, with whom by God's great mercy we too hope in his own good time to be made partakers of his glorious promises.

APPENDICES.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

LECTURE I., p. 11.—"*Professor Ramsay has lately shown their special dangers*," *etc.* In his recent work, "The Church in the Roman Empire." (Preface, p. viii.) He is speaking of German conclusions in New Testament criticism, but, as shown in Lecture II., the essential similarity of their treatment of the Old Testament writings justifies the application of his words to that subject also.

"If I reach conclusions very different from those of the school of criticism whose originators and chief exponents are German, it is not that I differ from their method. I fully accept their principle, that the sense of these documents can be ascertained only by resolute criticism; but I think that they have often carried out their principle badly, and that their criticism often offends against critical methods. True criticism must be sympathetic, but in investigations into religion, Greek, Roman, and Christian alike, there appears to me, if I may venture to say so, to be in many German scholars (the greatest excepted), a lack of that instinctive

sympathy with the life and nature of a people which is essential to the right use of critical processes. None admires and reverences German scholarship more than I do, but it has not taught me to be blind to faults or to be afraid to speak out."

An instructive illustration of the kind of evidence which led Professor Ramsay to express this judgment upon a school in which he had himself been trained will be found in the discussion on "The Royal Road," p. 32 ff.

APPENDIX B.

"*Limitations which affected alike the scope of His teaching*," *etc.* (p. 25).

It seems unfortunate that this matter should have been so closely connected with a largely irrelevant controversy as to the limits of our Lord's human knowledge—a region of thought which is so sacred and probably so far beyond our powers that it behoves our words in regard to it to be few, and our very thoughts kept under strong restraint—the last subject surely to be brought into the arena of mere intellectual or critical discussion. The questions connected with our Lord's use of the Old Testament

seem essentially akin, not so much to this deep and mysterious subject, as to the essential laws of Divine Revelation, and the Divine accommodation to circumstance and human capacity which lies inherent in the very conception of Revelation itself. We are familiar with the thought of an ethical accommodation of Almighty God to the varying stages of progress of His sinful creatures. Our Lord Himself lays stress upon a typical instance of this in S. Matt. xix. 8; cf. also Gen. xxii. 2, as an Old Testament example. In S. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9, compared with S. Mark x. 11, and parallels, we have almost certainly an accommodation of the Christian law of marriage, rendered necessary by the Mosaic enactment as to the punishment of adultery, which was still in force whilst the older covenant was not yet done away. So in our Lord's adaptation of His teaching with regard to His own Person and work to the slowly growing apprehension of the Disciples, we have a clear instance of similar limitation in teaching. Thus, when on the point of leaving them, He could say, *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now*, and so commit them unto the enlightenment of that Blessed Spirit, who should

guide the Apostles *into all the truth*, and supply that which our Lord had designedly left lacking in His own spoken words. If this be the case with regard to matters so supremely important, is it a strange assumption that, in any case, our Lord would naturally have spoken to the Jews of the authorship of their Sacred Scriptures in the way in which they could alone have understood Him, and would not have partially defeated His own purpose by entering upon comparatively irrelevant critical matters where His hearers could not have followed Him? Whatever view we may hold in regard to this difficult question, at any rate it should be based upon the general analogy of Revelation, and not carried up into a mysterious region with which it has properly little or nothing to do.

APPENDIX C.

"*The Elohistic and Jahvistic sources respectively*" (p. 47).

It has been thought better in a treatise dealing with critical matters to employ the nomenclature usual in the critical writings, so speaking of a "Jahvistic" rather than of a "Je-

hovistic" source. It seems well also to call attention to the fact that the spelling of the Divine Name which has become familiar and hallowed to readers of the English Bible has no ancient authority. All ancient authority is unanimous that the first syllable of the Sacred Name is to be vocalized Jah, a form which is preserved in the English Bible in Ps. lxviii. 4. An unfortunate confusion, originating in the sixteenth century, led to the adoption of the form "Jehovah," by which the identity of the abbreviated form of the Sacred Name employed in Ps. lxviii. 4 with that generally used is greatly obscured. After some hesitation, therefore, the form Jahveh has been employed throughout the book. It is hardly necessary to add that the change of vocalization does not imply any alteration of meaning. The two forms connote precisely the same thing.

APPENDIX D.

"*Eichorn was a thorough-going Rationalist of the eighteenth century type*" (p. 50).

"*Schleiermacher, with whom religion was rather a matter of the heart than of the head,*" *etc.* (p. 55).

It may be of interest to note the contemporary estimate of these men as given by an English scholar of high reputation, who was at the time a post-graduate student attending their lectures. The extracts are from Liddon's "Life of E. B. Pusey, D.D.," vol. i.

"In 1825 Eichorn was lecturing on . . . the Books of Moses. Pusey attended the . . . course. He was struck by Eichorn's total insensibility to the real religious import of the narrative, although the critical and historical information was often astonishing. . . . Yet Eichorn certainly meant to be on his guard against the shallow and frivolous scornfulness of vulgar unbelief. Only in him religious interests were entirely subordinate to the supposed interests of literature; the supernatural element was treated not as an objective reality, but as representing an ancient and profoundly interesting state of mind. . . . Eichorn assumed that every phenomenon in revealed religion had a human origin," etc. (pp. 73–75).

"Frederick Ernest Daniel Schleiermacher was, in 1825, the most commanding figure in the religious world of Berlin, and indeed in Protestant Germany. . . . Pusey often spoke in later life of his intercourse with Schleiermacher, and would describe him as a man of great earnestness and genius, who was feeling his way back from rationalism toward positive truth. . . . Even Schleiermacher's mistakes were sometimes allied to the upward tendency of his thought. If he erred in making feeling alone the seat of religion

in the soul, he was opposing the narrow academical tendency to treat revealed religion as merely a subject for philosophical discussion, or the Kantian tendency to resolve it into mere morality. The bias of his mind in his later years was toward an increased reverence for the Bible. . . . Schleiermacher's theory, which makes religion consist altogether in a feeling of dependence on God—exaggerated though it was—powerfully appealed to elements in Pusey's character ; and it is even probable that Pusey owed the beginnings of some prominent features of his devotional life to his intercourse with Schleiermacher " (pp. 80–84).

APPENDIX E.

" The most recent critical school represented in Germany by Strack and Kittel" (p. 66).

Professor Briggs thus describes the position of these scholars :

" They are agreed as to the order of development of E, J, and D, but think that the legislation of P is in the main pre-exilic, and that a considerable part of it is very ancient. They magnify the amount of ancient and original documents used by P " (" Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 130).

But if this be true, what becomes of the Wellhausen position as to the character of P, and of the grounds on which it was rested. It

is clear that the difference is only one of degree between the position of this newest German school and the old view of the superior antiquity of P. So the critical wheel goes round.

APPENDIX F.

"*Both the construction and the subject-matter make it very difficult for us not to regard the last verse* (Gen. xix. 22) *as the final summing up of a narrative like the existing account in Genesis*" (p. 75).

How strong the presumption is may be gathered from the verdict of Bleek on this matter, writing at a time when the current critical theory placed no obstacle in the way of accepting the natural literary deduction from the sacred text. The quotations are from Bleek's "Introduction to the Old Testament" (èd. Venables), vol. i.

"The author, in the further course of the book" (*i.e.*, in the later Patriarchal narratives) "has not fully adopted the Elohistic work in all his narratives, but has somewhat revised and enlarged it, though in some places he has also abridged and omitted; of this there are distinct traces. Thus it results from the decidedly Elohistic

verse (ch. xix. 29) that just before, in the Elohistic writing, there must have been an account of Lot, and particularly of his sojourn in Sodom; but the later reviser cannot have included this account in his work as he there found it, as what goes before referring to Lot, particularly as to his separation from Abraham, is Jehovistic" (p. 294).

"The manner in which the later author has continually, and in increasing measure as his work advanced, dealt with the ancient Elohistic document, prevents us in many instances from effecting any detailed determination between the matter which belongs to it and that which does not" (p. 295).

Of course Bleek is now considered quite out of date. The fashionable critical hypothesis as to the relative dates of P and J is the exact reverse of that which he held. But surely that method of literary analysis must be very unsound which from a mere reversal of the relative dates of P and J deduces completely irreconcilable results as to the nature of the original document of P. It is quite evident what Bleek would have said to the argument from the "silence of P," yet on such a flimsy foundation as this we are asked to accept the whole Wellhausen theory as to the antagonistic stand-points of P and J with all the repulsive consequences which flow therefrom.

APPENDIX G.

LECTURE II., p. 81.—"*The same method has been applied to the Homeric writings*," *etc.* A full discussion of this question will be found in "Homer and the Epic," by A. Lang (Longmans). The following extracts will show the remarkable parallelism between the Wolfian theory and the corresponding elements of the Old Testament criticism:

"Wolf's theory is that writing was not used for literary purposes when first the Homeric lays were sung, nor for hundreds of years afterwards. That through these hundreds of years, the lays floated in the memory of rhapsodes, who being also poets, altered and added to them at will. Then they were reduced to writing for the first time in the age of Pisistratus" (p. 76).

Compare with this Professor Sanday's account of the literary history of the Old Testament Books cited in Lecture II., pp. 48, 49.

Mr. Lang's emphatic verdict upon the Wolfian hypothesis is as follows:

"The whole argument of Wolf no longer holds water. . . . Modern discoveries have destroyed his premises so far as writing is concerned" (p. 77).

APPENDIX H.

"*S. Augustine states it as a commonplace that the object of Holy Scripture is to teach men things of which they ought not to be ignorant, yet cannot know of themselves*" (p. 93).

The quotation is from the "De Civ. Dei," XI., 3. The whole passage is as follows:

"Hic prius per Prophetas, deinde per se ipsum, postea per Apostolos, quantum satis esse judicavit, locutus, etiam Scripturam condidit, quæ canonica nominatur, eminentissimæ auctoritatis, cui fidem habemus de his rebus quas ignorare non expedit nec per nosmet ipsos nosse idonei sumus. Nam si ea sciri possunt testibus nostris, quæ remota non sunt e sensibus nostris sive interioribus sive etiam exterioribus; unde et præsentia nuncupantur, quod ita ea dicimus esse præ sensibus, sicut præ oculis quæ præsto sunt oculis; perfecto ea quæ remota sunt a sensibus nostris, quoniam nostro testimonio scire non possumus, de his alios testes requirimus, eisque credimus a quorum sensibus remota esse vel fuisse non credimus."

The passage forms part of an introduction to the exposition of the narrative of Creation in the early chapters of Genesis, similar in character to that in the "De Genesi ad litteram."

Note also the following from the same

work (XIX., 18). Referring to the Neo-Platonists, "quibus incerta sunt omnia," he says:

"Omnino civitas Dei talem dubitationem tanquam dementiam detestatur, habens de rebus, quas mente atque ratione comprehendit, etiamsi parvam propter corpus corruptibile, quod aggravat animam, quoniam sicut dicit Apostolus, *ex parte scimus*, tamen certissimam scientiam; creditque sensibus in rei cujusque evidentia, quibus per corpus animus utitur; quoniam miserabilius fallitur, qui nunquam putat eis esse credendum. Credit etiam Scripturis sanctis et veteribus et novis, quas Canonicas appellamus, unde fides ipsa concepta est, ex qua justus vivit; per quam sine dubitatione ambulamus, quamdiu perigrinamus a Domino; qua salva atque certa de quibusdam rebus, quas neque sensu, neque ratione percepimus, neque nobis per Scripturam canonicam claruerunt, nec per testes quibus non credere absurdum est, in nostram notitiam pervenerunt, sine justa reprehensione dubitamus."

For practical instances of the way in which S. Augustine embodied these principles in his own teaching, showing his anxiety to bring to bear upon the interpretation of Holy Scripture each branch of knowledge in its proper sphere, see the following passages from "De Genesi ad litteram, I., 21 (differing lengths of day and night in various parts of the earth); I., 39 (warning against rash interpretations conflict-

ing with the laws of nature; II., 2 (discussion as to the way in which water can be stored in the air as vapour); II., 20 (as to the shape of the firmament surrounding the earth); II., 23 (on the rotation of the heavenly bodies); II., 23 (as to the phases of the moon); IV., 51 (a striking picture of the creation as containing germinally within itself the seeds of a progressive evolution); VI., 18 (a similar passage); VII., 20 (as to the connection of nervous action throughout the body into the brain, and the effects which follow from various lesions of the brain, demonstrating the distribution of the seats of various faculties within it).

It may be well to note the fine passage on the inevitable limitation of human knowledge in the "De Genesi ad litteram," VI., 34. The following extracts will sufficiently indicate the line of thought, but the whole passage well deserves perusal:

"(Deus) propinquior nobis est qui fecit, quam multa quæ facta sunt."

"Ignota enim sunt fundamenta terræ oculis nostris, et qui fundavit terram, propinquat mentibus nostris."

APPENDIX I.

The spiritual lessons which lie enshrined in the several "days" may be studied in the pages of S. Augustine (p. 124).

The following quotations will give a fair view of S. Augustine's teaching with regard to the "days." The references, unless otherwise stated, are to the "De Genesi ad litteram."

Some things in the narrative of Genesis must clearly be taken figuratively:

"Nam non esse accipienda figuraliter, nullus Christianus dicere audebit, attendens Apostolum dicentem, *omnia autem hæc in figura contingebant illis;* et illud quod in Genesi scriptum est, *et erant duo in carne una*" (I., 1).

After noting that day and night are of different lengths at various parts of the earth's surface (I., 21), he suggests that "one day" includes all time, as follows:

"An hic dies toties temporis nomen est, et omnia volumina sæculorum hoc vocabulo includit; ideoque non dictus est primus, sed unus dies" (I., 33).

The appointment of the great luminaries *for signs and for seasons, and for days and years,* upon the fourth "day," suggests that the language is figurative and leads on to the following important statement:

"Vespera autem et mane non quasi per temporis præteritionem et adventum, sed per quendam terminum, quo intelligitur quousque sit naturæ proprius modus, et unde sit naturæ alterius consequenter exordium" (II., 28).

Similar in effect is his comment upon the absence of mention of "the evening and the morning" in regard to "the seventh day."

"Si in cæteris diebus vespera et mane talium temporum vices significant, qualia nunc per hæc quotidiana spatia peraguntur, non video quid prohibuerit et septimum diem vespera, noctem ejusdem mane concludere, ut similiter diceretur, et facta est vespera, et factum est mane, dies septimus (IV., 33).

"The seventh day" clearly does not denote a mere temporal Divine resting: "Ipse nec cum creavit defessus, nec cum cessavit refectus est" (IV., 25), but represents the inner life of God, Who hath no need of any created thing.

"Insinuatur nobis Deus per hanc scripturam, qua dicitur requievisse ab omnibus operibus suis quæ fecit, nullo opere suo sic delectatus quasi faciendi ejus eguerit, vel minor futurus nisi fecisset, vel beatior cum fecisset" (IV., 26).

The sanctification of the seventh day was for our sakes, a benediction of the inner supernatural life of the soul: and so the Christian

"perpetuum Sabbatum jam observat, . . . ut in novitate vitæ ambulans, Deum in se operari cognoscat, qui simul et operatur, et quiescit, et creaturæ præbens congruam gubernationem, et apud se habens æternam tranquillitatem" (IV., 24).

He concludes his argument on this head, after stating that these "days" contain within themselves a great mystery, by an emphatic disclaimer of their resembling ordinary periods of time.

"Istos septem dies, qui pro illis agunt hebdomadem, cujus cursu et recursu tempora rapiuntur, in qua dies unus est a solis ortu usque in ortum circuitus, sic illorum vicem quamdam exhibere credamus, ut non eos illis similes, sed multum impares minime dubitemus" (IV., 44).

To a similar effect, the passage from the "De Civitate Dei," quoted by Delitzch in his "New Commentary on Genesis," vol. i., p. 84.

"Qui dies cujusmodi sint; aut perdifficile nobis aut etiam impossibile est cogitare, quanto magis dicere" (De Civ. Dei, XI., 6).

Another favorite thought with S. Augustine is that the "day of creation" was both an ending and a beginning, as he explains below.

" Nunc autem quia jam et consummata quodammodo, et quodammodo inchoata sunt ea ipsa quæ consequentibus evolvenda temporibus primitus Deus omnia simul creavit, cum faceret mundum ; consummata quidem quia nihil habent illa in naturis propriis, quibus suorum temporum cursus agunt, quod non in istis causaliter factum sit ; inchoata vero, quoniam quædam erant quasi semina futurorum, per seculi tractum ex occulto in manifestum locis congruis exserenda " (VI., 18).

With reference to the Divine Word in creation :

" Cum ergo audimus, *Et dixit Deus, fiat ;* intelligimus quod in Verbo Dei erat ut fieret. . . . Non ergo Deus toties dixit, Fiat illa vel illa creatura, quoties in hoc libro repetitur, *Et dixit Deus.* Unum quippe Verbum ille genuit, in quo dixit omnia, priusquam facta sunt singula ; sed elogium scribentis descendens ad parvulorum capacitatem, dum insinuat singulatim genera creaturarum, per singula respicit uniuscujusque generis æternam rationem in Verbo Dei ; nec illa repetita, ille tamen repetit, *Et dixit Deus.*

" Cum vero audimus, *Et sic est factum ;* intelligimus factam creaturam non excessisse præscriptos in Verbo Dei terminos genesis sui.

" Cum vero audimus, *Et vidit Deus quia bonum est,* intelligimus in benignitate spiritus ejus, non quasi cognitum posteaquam factum est placuisse, sed potius in ea bonitate placuisse ut maneret factum, ubi placebat ut fieret " (II., 13, 14).

Mr. Coggin's book, "Man's Great Charter," will show how fully a modern writer has imbibed the spirit of S. Augustine, whilst in perfect sympathy with the most recent scientific investigations. I subjoin a few extracts pertinent to the matter in hand.

"Day is not a time-word, but stands for that state or those laws of existence by means of which any thing is what it is, or for the very essence of that to which it is related" (p. 44).

Thus "God's days make man's days possible. God's working makes man's working possible" (p. 35).

"The correspondence between God's days and man's days is like that between foundation and superstructure, or between substance and shadow, or between the original and its image" (p. 36).

"The seventh day, without beginning or end, marks the changeless attributes of God; the six days whose beginnings are noted, but of whose end no hint is given, mark the reality of the Divine activity. Each of the six days is brought to morning, all six are continued. Man lives in these six days" (p. 59).

"The six days are insufficient for man, with these alone his nature remains in partial eclipse, but when God shines upon him, the dim recesses of his being are flooded with light and his dullest task is brightened with a radiance not its own" (p. 192).

"It is not sufficient for a man to work like a horse, he must work like God" (p. 201).

APPENDIX J.

"The questions raised by the genealogies in Chapter V., and the numbers therein contained, which appear as insoluble upon the critical as upon the traditional methods" (p. 157).

The following citations from Kuenen's "Les Origines du Texte Mazorétique," Paris, 1875, a critical examination of various hypotheses as to the origin of the differences in the Hebrew, LXX., and Samaritan texts, will substantiate the position above taken. The extracts represent Kuenen's final summing up of the whole matter:

"La difficulté soulevée par les trois textes de Genèse v. et xi., 10–26, n'est pas encore résolue. . . . La démonstration que je demande n'a pas encore été fournie, et vous m'en croirez volontiers sur parole si je me déclare hors d'état de résoudre le problème d'une manière tout à fait satisfaisante" (p. 46).

And again:

"Dans le jugement que je porte sur toutes ces solutions de la difficulté, je me trouve d'accord avec Geiger, dont le propos sur ce sujet contient bien des choses excellentes. Il réussit à expliquer d'une manière simple et naturelle un certain nombre de divergences petites ou grandes des trois recensions, en se servant des indices fournis par les traditions juive et samaritaine elles-mêmes. Mais lui aussi ne va pas plus loin. Nous

pouvons toujours demander si, après avoir constaté ces divergences, et apporté au texte les corrections qui en découlent, nous avons complètement atteint le but que nous poursuivons ; en d'autres termes, ce qui est relativement plus original, est-il aussi l'original ? Ici Geiger nous laisse dans l'incertitude " (pp. 49, 50).

To a similar effect Dillmann in the last edition of his " Commentary on Genesis " :

" Das zu grund liegende Princip der Berechnung ist bis jezt nicht gefunden. Das Problem ist um so schwieriger, weil in diesen Zahlen die ältesten kritischen Zeugen, der hbr., Samar., u. LXX. Text stark von einander abweichen " (p. 110).

Upon Budde's plan for identifying the latter half of the genealogy in Genesis v. with that in Genesis iv. 16–19, Dillmann's verdict is adverse.

" Aber auch dieser Construction ist mehr scharfsinnig als beifallswürdig " (p. 109).

APPENDIX K.

" *The analysis would present much less difficulty under the assumption which until quite recently was universally made* " (p. 174).

It is interesting that an acute critic like Bleek

claims, from a consideration of the simple text, to arrive at a conclusion absolutely opposed to the present critical theory. This is a strong confirmation of the position taken in the present work. Bleek is speaking of the history of the Flood, on which he remarks as follows:

"The consideration of the context here, *quite apart from the changes in the naming of God*, shows that the Jehovistic passages of the narrative did not originally belong to it. It cannot fail to be observed that the connection is often interrupted by the Jehovistic passages, and that by cutting them out a more natural and clearer continuity of the narrative is almost always obtained" (p. 273).

[The italics have been added to emphasize Bleek's claim to deduce his results directly from literary considerations, irrespective of any deduction from the use of the Divine Names.]

In plain truth the current hypothesis does violence to the literary phenomena of this section. It is maintained not in consequence of the literary facts, but in spite of them, and really rests upon different foundations altogether, viz., the assumptions as to the widely differing dates of the three Pentateuchal codes and in regard to the law of the one sanctuary.

APPENDIX L.

The following analysis of the first nine chapters of Genesis may illustrate the argument of Lectures III., IV., and the first half of Lecture V.:

I. THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION, OR THE DIVINE CHARTER SHOWING THE ESSENTIAL RELATIONS OF MAN, THE WORLD, AND GOD. I. 1–II. 4

(*A*) The First Creative Act—Creation of Physical Nature. I. 1

Detailed reference to the Divine Volition carried out by the Eternal WORD of five groups or orders of the Physical world.

(1) Light, or the foundations of Physical Order and Law. I. 2–6. Day i.

(2) Firmament, connecting the earth with the greater order of the universe outside. I. 6–9. Day ii.

(3) Separation of earth and waters, adapting the earth for vegetation and life. I. 9–11.

(4) Production of vegetable life, for the support of sentient living things and for beauty. I. 11–14. } Day iii.

(5) Luminaries, adapting the earth to sentient and rational life, embodying the principle of rational order. I. 14–20. — Day iv.

(*B*) The Second Creative Act—Creation of sentient Life. — I. 21

Detailed reference to the Divine Volition carried out by the Eternal WORD, of two groups or orders of sentient life.

(6) Life in water and air. I. 20–24. — Day v.

(7) Animal life on the earth. I. 24–26.

(*C*) The Third Creative Act—Creation of man as a rational and spiritual being, capable of progress and perfection. I. 27.

Detailed Reference to the Divine Volition carried out by the Eternal WORD, of the following relations: — Day vi.

(8) Relation of Man to Nature as representative of God's character and authority therein. I. 26, 28.

(9) Relation of Vegetable to sentient life as its source of sustenance and support. I. 29–31.

Solemn ratification of the whole order as corresponding to the Divine purpose. I. 31, II. 1.

(*D*) The Divine Rest, or the unseen order: the Eternal world of GOD, to which the visible universe stands in closest relationship, and by which the higher life and worship of man is sustained. I. 2–4.1 Day vii.

II. THE GENERATIONS OF THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH, OR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HIGHER LIFE OF MAN IN ITS ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES, AS SEEN IN THE DIVINE PURPOSE ORIGINALLY, AND AS IT HAS ACTUALLY COME TO BE. II. 4–IV. 26

(*A*) The Development of the higher life of man in its essential principles as seen in the Divine purpose originally. II. 4–25

(1) Recapitulation showing—

(*a*) Initial chaotic condition of things. II. 5, 6

(*b*) Man's double relationship; on his physical side to the earth, on his spiritual side to the Divine world. II. 7

(2) The first Paradise: its nature, limitations, and blessings.

(*a*) The nature of the Paradise. II. 8–15

(*b*) The commission to man in regard to it. II. 15

(*c*) Its blessings and the law of probation it enshrined. II. 16–18

(3) The relation of man to woman a Divine provision for the higher development of man's nature.

(*a*) Reference to the Divine Volition of this relation in its higher aspects. II. 18

(*b*) The insufficiency of the animal creation for this purpose demonstrated. II. 19–21

(*c*) The Divine protection of woman, alike in her origin and in the charter of her mission. II. 21–25

(*d*) The absence of any polluting element in this relation. II. 25

(*B*) The development of the higher life of man in its essential principles, as it has actually come to be. III. 1–IV. 26

(1) The Profanation of the first Paradise.

(*a*) The entrance of Evil through the Creation. III. 1

(*b*) The temptation and fall of the woman. III. 2–6^{b}

(*c*) The temptation and fall of the man. III. 6^{b}

(2) The essential consequences of this profanation.

(*a*) Man's ineffectual attempt to cover his sin from GOD. III. 7, 8

(*b*) The subterfuge defeated and the sin unveiled. III. 9–14

(*c*) The judgment on the source of temptations, with the sentence of its final overthrow by the SEED of the woman. III. 14–16

(*d*) The judgment on the woman, in which the tie to her husband which she has profaned becomes the source of her punishment and the channel of her discipline. III. 16

(*e*) The judgment on the man in which the tie to Nature which he has profaned becomes the source of his punishment and the channel of his discipline. III. 17–20

(*f*) The Divine cleansing and covering of sin foreshadowed. III. 20–22

(*g*) The withdrawal of the privileges of the profaned sanctuary. III. 22–25

(3) The radical schism thus introduced into human development between nature and grace, between the natural and the spiritual man.

(*a*) The enmity between the child of fallen nature and the child of grace. IV. 1–9

(*b*) The judgment upon Cain; the tie of brotherhood which he has profaned, the source of his punishment and the channel of his discipline. IV. 9–16

(4) The sentence carried out, and the protection of Noah as the subject of the saving purposes of GOD. VII. 6–VIII. 15

(5) The new sphere of man's development and the acceptance of the worship of the new election. VIII. 15–22

(6) The charter of the relations between man, the world, and GOD restored and reaffirmed. IX. 1–18

(7) The fall of Noah and the Divine oracle in regard to the differing destinies of the three great families of mankind. IX. 18–29

The "generations of the sons of Noah," which follow from Chapter x. to xi. 10 (containing the "table of the Nations"), form the connecting link between this "Prologue" to all subsequent Revelation and the Patriarchal History.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

SOME LIGHTS OF SCIENCE ON THE FAITH: Being the Bampton Lectures for 1892.

By the Rt. Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., Canon of Windsor, formerly Bishop of Sydney, Metropolitan of New South Wales, and Primate of Australia. 8vo, $3.00.

"His discussion on the distinction between revelation and inspiration is nothing less than masterly; and in every part of the work there is a spirit of breadth and freedom which belongs only to a man who stands firmly on the broad foundation of the Catholic Faith, as distinguished from the transitory platform of individual opinion."—*The Church Standard*, Philadelphia.

THE PRIMITIVE SAINTS AND THE SEE OF ROME.

By F. W. PULLER, M.A., Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford. Crown 8vo, $2.25.

"The author accomplishes his purpose most effectively, writing with a clearness and pungency which are heightened by his careful moderation and Christian friendliness of temper. Facts that most of us either did not know at all, or knew only in a hazy dispersedness, he brings together into a most convincing focus. . . . We know nothing better than this modest work to explain the extreme resentment of Ultra-montanism at all attempts of Catholics to ascertain what history says about the papal claims."—*Andover Review.*

GOD'S CITY: Four Addresses delivered at St. Asaph on the Spiritual and Ethical Value of Belief in the Church. To which are added six sermons on kindred subjects.

By the Rev. H. S. HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

"As to their teaching, we think them to be admirable models of the spirit in which instruction concerning the Church should be given."
—*Churchman*, New York.

"We sometimes wonder why some sermons find their way into print; but sermons such as these are in the character of an inspiration that not only find their way into print, but into the hearts and lives of all who hear or read them."
—*Living Church*, Chicago.

SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF CHRIST.

By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

CLERICAL LIFE AND WORK. A Collection of Sermons with an Essay 'The Priest in his inner life.'

By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME: Its Foundation and Duties.

By the Rev. W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester and Rector of Hoar Cross. Crown 8vo, $1.75.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS ON EVERY VERSE OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

With a Preface by the Rt. Rev. EDWARD KING, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln. Crown 8vo, 306 pages, $1.50.

This work is uniform with the author's four previous volumes of Reflections on Genesis, the Psalms, the Holy Gospels, and Acts to the Revelation, which were commended by prefaces written by the late Canon Liddon and the Bishop of Lincoln.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 15 East 16th Street, New York.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION.

By MANDEL CREIGHTON, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. Vol. V. The German Revolt, 1517–1527. 8vo, 396 pages, $5.00.

*** Vols. I. and II. 1378–1464, $10.50. Vols. III. and IV. 1464–1518, $8.00.

"It is excellent in every way, and not least for its remarkable impartiality. We can scarcely believe that Roman Catholic readers would complain of any unfairness, for indeed the Papacy from 1517 to 1527 has been treated by Roman Catholic writers with far greater severity than Bishop Creighton allows himself . . . assuredly, for careful students of history, who desire to find, in what actually did happen in the past, safe lessons for the present and the future, the unimpassioned narrative of Bishop Creighton is unmeasurably more valuable than the most artistic 'word-painting.'"—THE CHURCHMAN, NEW YORK.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (1800-1833).

Works by JOHN HENRY OVERTON, M.A., Canon of Lincoln, and Rector of Epworth. 8vo, $4.00.

"The whole book is worthy, not only of perusal, but of close study and of much reflection. Its temper is perfect. Dr. Overton endeavors to tell the truth without exaggeration or extenuation. He is as judicious in comment as he is discriminatingly just in judgment. His style is admirably lucid, and the self-restraint with which he eschews rhetorical adornment makes his statements all the more impressive. No one who would have an adequate conception of the progress of the Church of England in the nineteenth century can dispense with this volume, and we repeat that any one who reads it with appreciation must needs be filled with hope for the future of a Church which has made such marvelous progress within the lifetime of living man."

—CHURCH STANDARD, PHILADELPHIA.

BUDDHISM, PRIMITIVE AND PRESENT; in Magadha and Ceylon.

By REGINALD STEPHEN COPLESTON, D.D., Bishop of Colombo, President of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. 8vo, $5.00.

"What strikes one with most force in this very able work in the clearness with which the author has written it. He has affected no mysteries, and has avoided, as far as possible, technical treatment, making the book interesting and instructive without unduly introducing learned terms or treatment. It will be found eagerly read by students of the oriental religions with which they come in contact in the east . . . his work is a valuable addition to our knowledge of Buddhism."—BOSTON HERALD.

WAYMARKS IN CHURCH HISTORY.

By the Rev. WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

"This collection of addresses and review articles, published by the author within ten years, might bear the appropriate name of Studies, among which, however, they would rank in the best and most delightful class. They are fine examples of that modern conception of history which lays the stress on the human interest and content of the history rather than on the bare facts and form of it. The range of the collection is wide."—NEW YORK INDEPENDENT.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 15 East 16th Street, New York.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

SPECULUM SACERDOTUM; or, the Divine Model of the Priestly Life.

By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Principal of the Ely Theological College, late Vicar of Malvern Link. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

"The author knows whereof he speaks, and, accordingly, every word tells. We know of no book that would give such real help to the clergy as this, none that would be so suitable as a gift to those about to be ordained on Trinity Sunday. Such encouragement and warning given at the outset of a man's ministry might change and uplift it."—*Churchman*, New York.

"We consider it a great pity that such a book as this, so freighted with instruction, so full of spirituality, so graceful in expression, so gracious in spirit, should be sent out under a title which implies that it is intended for the clergy only. There is a compensation, however, in the thought that every clergyman who reads it will be likely to preach it over and over again to the people of his charge."—*The Church Standard*, Philadelphia.

THE TRUTH AND REALITY OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE, Proved from Holy Scripture, the Teaching of the Primitive Church, and the Book of Common Prayer.

By GEORGE RUNDLE PRYNNE, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Plymouth, Author of "The Eucharistic Manual," etc. Crown 8vo, $1.25.

THE INSPIRED WORD. Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1893.

By the Rev. W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 8vo, $4.00.

"It is pervaded throughout by the reverent spirit of its author, who, in his searching of the Scriptures, has been governed throughout by an honest desire to discover the truth, and who does believe that they were given by inspiration of God. We do not see how any preacher can fail to study it who is as anxious as he ought to be to give a reason for the faith that is in him. . . . No book can be better for the purpose than this, taking it altogether; for it is not only the most recent, but it is the work of an acknowledged scholar, who is, moreover, a reverent one, and one, too, who would rather build up than pull down."
—*Pacific Churchman*, San Francisco.

THE VIRGIN MOTHER. Retreat Addresses on the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as Told in the Gospels. With an Appended Essay on the Virgin Birth of our Lord.

By the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. 12mo. $1.25.

THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM CONSIDERED AS THE EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION.

By MORGAN DIX, S.T.D., D.C.L., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. Crown 8vo, 260 pages, $1.50.

"Presented as it is in these pages in a fresh and lively way, in clear and persuasive argument, it touches the soul, excites the imagination, and deepens one's faith. . . . The treatment is scholarly and philosophical, the discussion logical and conclusive, the style clear and calm, and the volume is timely and helpful."
—*Living Church*, Chicago.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 15 East 16th Street, New York.

WORKS BY HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L.

Late Chancellor and Canon of St. Paul's.

The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. Fourteenth Edition. With New Preface. Crown 8vo.....$2.00

Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford. (First Series, 1859–1868.) Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo.....$1.50
(Second Series, 1868–1882.) Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo.....$1.50

Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford. New Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo.....$2.00

Advent in St. Paul's. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Two Comings of Our Lord. New Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. $2.00

Christmastide in St. Paul's. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Birth of Our Lord and the End of the Year. Crown 8vo.....$2.00

Passiontide; Sermons bearing chiefly on the Passion of our Lord. 1 vol. Crown 8vo.....$2.00

Easter in St. Paul's. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of Our Lord. New Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. $2.00

Sermons on Old Testament Subjects. Crown 8vo. $2.00

Sermons on Some Words of Christ. Crown 8vo. $2.00

The Magnificat. Sermons in St. Paul's, August, 1889. Crown 8vo.....$1.00

Walter Kerr Hamilton, Bishop of Salisbury. A Sketch. Third Edition. 8vo.....$1.00

Some Elements of Religion. Lent Lectures. Fifth and cheaper Edition. Small 8vo.....$1.00

Of the Five Wounds of the Holy Church. By Antonio Rosmini. Edited, with an Introduction, by H. P. Liddon. Crown 8vo.....$2.50

A Manual for the Sick. With other Devotions. By Lancelot Andrewes, D.D. Edited, with a Preface, by H. P. Liddon. With Portrait. Large Type. Fourth Edition. 24mo.....$0.90

Maxims and Gleanings from the Writings of H. P. Liddon. Selected and arranged for Daily Use, by C. M. S. Square 16mo.....$0.60

Selections from the Writings of H. P. Liddon, D.D. New Edition. Crown 8vo.....$1.25

Essays and Addresses. Lectures on Buddhism—Lectures on the Life of St. Paul—Papers on Dante. Crown 8vo.....$1.50

Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Crown 8vo. $4.00

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 15 East 16th Street, New York.